REFERENCE TO THE RESENTMENT IN TAMIL NADU OVER HOLDING OF INTERVIEWS IN KERALA FOR THE "SKYLARK PROJECT" LOCATED IN TAMIL NADU

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu): Madam Deputy Chairman, I want to bring to the attention of the Government through you a serious problem which has created resentment in the minds of the people of Tamil Nadu.

Madam, the prestigious project of our Navy called the "Skylark Project" has been started in my own district, Tirunelveli, the southernmost part of our country. Madam, our honourable Chairman, when he was the Defence Minister, came thereto inaugurate this project. While inaugurating this project, the then Defence Minister, Shri R. Venkataraman, assured that the project would generate employment opportunities for the people of Tamil Nadu, particularly for those of the southern districts of the State, which are affected the most repeatedly by drought and other things. But, Madam, the people had the shock of their life when they came to know that interviews for recruitment to even civil services, that is, recruitment for the posts of draughtsman, chaprasi, etc. were to be conducted not in Tamil Nadu, but in the State of Kerala in Cochin. There are more than fifty officials in this project who are from Kerala and they have cleverly manipulated certain things. Therefore, the interview was fixed in the State of Kerala in Cochin. Then demonstrations and rallies by the people, cutting across party lines, were organised in those areas. I sent two telegrams to the then Defence Minister. In the first of week of April, I spoke to Mr. V. P. Singh, the then Defence Minister over the telephone from my area. Then he promised me that he would look into the matter. But they did is that they cancelled this interview which was fixed for the 2nd April and they postponed it to the 15th April and then they cleverly did one thing. They said that they would call for a list from the employment Exchange of Tirunelveli. But nobody will accept this. This is a great injustice. Even the Parliamentary Affairs Minister, Mr. Jacob, will understand the agony and the agony of the people of Tamil Nadu. If a project is working in Kerala, will the people of Kerala tolerate if the interview is held in Tamil Nadu? This is not an interview for recruitment of military personnel. This is only for recruitment of civil personnel and the interview was fixed in Kerala in Cochin. This project is to monitor the movement of even submarines in the Indian Ocean and this is a very prestigious project. Thousands of acres of land were acquired from the people of Tamil Nadu and when the question of interview comes, the recruitment is to be made in Kerala* That is because of the vested interests, particularly officials, who have come from that State and who are handling the affairs of this project. Therefore, Madam, I want protection through you from this Government and I want the Government to protect the interests of the people of Tamil Nadu.

I would, therefore, request the Government to cancel the interview which has been conducted and the interviews hereafter should be conducted in Tirunelveli or Kanyakumari in Tamil Nadu. Otherwise, Madam, our State will become the colony of another State which is already going on and this cannot be tolerated and the Government of India must immediately take into consideration my demand because our Government, the Government of Tamil Nadu, is in deep slumber.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have an announcement to make: The Chairman has removed the remarks both of Mr. Pachouri and of the Chair from the record.

Now, we resume discussion, further discussion on the working of the Ministry of External Affairs. Prof. Chandresh Thakur will continue his speech.

DISCUSSION ON THE WORKING OF THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—Contd.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR (Bihar): Thank you, Madam. Continuing my submission on the Non-Aligned

[Prof. Chandresh P. Thakur]

thinking on its working is called for. And for this purpose the original three-country team could go back to the drawing board or another group could come out with still brighter and worthwhile ideas. Incidentally, India, Yugoslavia and Egypt can and must do better bilaterally as well than what they have done so far. A promising area for intensified effort relates to economic issues: collapse of development process in Africa is a grim reality; the dead weight of external debt is hurting the developing countries; aid as well as trade scene is getting dismal; barriers to labour migration are mounting; technology transfer is extremely grudging. They all hurt NAM countries.

The Brasilia ministerial meeting has evolved a framework for the Global System of Trade Preferences. We hope this will have some impact in the next UNCTED. Economic cooperation among developing countries needs a concrete agenda, adequate fund support and definite progress in terms of implementation. Therefore the NAM coordinating bureau must work harder and vigorously for demonstrated result.

Let me now briefly touch on security, peace and our external relations.

Madam, anatomy of power among nations throws painful realities. Lack of power makes a nation vulnerable, but power for some combined with notoriety could be a disaster for the rest. The camouflage of one or the other ideology does not make it any less terrible. It is a callous world where military arms aid is mounting, with dwindling development assistance. To quote Robert Pollock from the 'The Course of Time':

"With one hand he put a penny in the urn of poverty

And with the other took a shilling out".

I think we have to reverse it. We have to continue to persevere in this regard.

Pursuit of sound and rewarding external relations, bilateral as well as multilateral, requires an incisive appreciation of major changes on the world scene and their changing constellations. The world is no more bi-polar. Nuclear proliferation is a fact despite the rhetoric to the contrary. Going nuclear brings respectability as China found, and a near nuclear status for some can bring bonanza of aid and support. Loci of economic power have now shifted from familiar centres and would shift still further. Collectively the Euyropean Economic Cooperation, OPEC, Gulf and ASEAN are areas of new reckoning, and individually Japan and West Germany are new countries to reckon with. Even technological clout is today being widely shared although still there is some regional concentration.

I think, from our point of view, we must note that the Sino-US-Pakistan axis has consolidated. How much more would it hurt. While our Minister of State for External Affairs was still catching his trans-Atlantic flight after energetic efforts at Washington. Words reached him from the Capital, and it was depressing. I think in our Indo-US relations we have to do a lot better than what so far we have been able to achieve. On the other side, the new nexus, that is, of Sino-Soviet relations, is warming up.

1.00 p.m.

we have to watch the entry of Pakistan in this nexus and we have to reflect on and prepare for its ramifications. Each of these requires continuous re-appraisal of our interests and correspondingly revised choice of strategies. On the other side, we must build our foreign policy on our strength. Our buying power today is indeed formidable. Then, the Indian economy provides a welcome investment climate in an otherwise depressed world economy. Our improved agriculture gives us the capacity to feed the vast needy regions. The technological, industrial and professional capabilities that we have built up over the last few decades should be of great assistance to developing countries. Overseas Indians with their financial resources as well as professional capability constitute a formidable asset on the world scene and this can be turned to our advantage.

But for a fuller use of these, we need acumen in economic diplomacy. I would like particularly to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that those involved in this complex terrain of international diplomacy require facility in economics and commerce as well as in science and technology. May be, they have it in our country. But is it in sufficient measure and does it not require an organised acquisition and renewal at discreet intervals?

Madam, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to certain aspects of policy research. There is much to gain from such an organised policy researchs in an institutionalised basis. We had it until recently. Probably we may have it again. But let us have it soon in a more organised way and on a continuing basis too.

Madam, a word about Afghanistan. It is a complex case. U.S. and Soviet citizens are paying heavily. It is immaterial which one is paying more. But for some it is emerging as milch cattle as it were. Mr. Gurupadaswamy said that we are a middle power. There are other countries which are similarly placed and with comparable concerns. We must forge links with them and work in a more concerted way.

Madam, India has made outstanding contributions earlier at the United Nations fora and done a lot to strengthen the U.N. system. This system is under severe stress and it needs a lot of support from us and our friends who think on similar lines. But its deliberations must also be more result-oriented. Rituals, formal sessions and country counts of voting behaviour are neither exciting nor promising enough. Our own contributions should be substantially improved qualitatively. I think the richness of these deliberations can improve through more imaginative initiatives, better negotiating skill and more skilled team work among newer groups of countries. At Punta da Etta, we discovered Brazil joining us and at the last *CHOGM* Australia and Canada teamed up with India in one of the major initiatives. These are evidences to suggest that this kind of new teaming up for specific set of purposes is feasible and India should be alert and could explore more such possibilities in this regard.

Madam, in the last few years, the Prime Minister has taken very interesting initiatives on the world scene. But we have to prepare ourselves to take advantage of that. The home work in the foreign office and in the diplomatic services should start. They must also acquire sufficient capability to ensure that we are able to anticipate developments more accurately and that our reflexes are much quicker than so far. With these words, Madam, I wish to support the activities of the Ministry of External Affairs and reiterate my faith in the new leadership which this Ministry has acquired.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN (West Bengal): Madam, while participating in this debate, I would begin with the first para of the Introduction to the Annual Report — 1986-87 issued by the Ministry of External Affairs.

Madam, in the first para itself, it says:

> "Peace, disarmament and development continued to be the main thrust of India's foreign policy during the year. Principles of non-alignment, the struggle for emancipation from all forms of colonialism and the promotion of freindship with all countries, particularly neighbours continued to inspire its conduct."

Madam, I would like to agree with these principles. And as for peace, I would also mention that the three important events in the year for the struggle for peace were the Soviet proposal for a nuclear free world, the Reykjavik Summit, and the Joint Indo-Soviet Delhi Declaration. And these three events showed the new initiative of the Soviet Union to prevent nuclear war. These also showed the refusal of the United States to respond to any genuine proposal to check the drive towards nuclear war, and the close understanding between the non-aligned India and the Socialist Soviet Union on the question of peace. Madam, I would also like to mention here that the Delhi Declaration expressed the will of the non-aligned nations, not only of India but also of the entire non-aligned

[Shri Sukomal Sen]

nations to co-operate with the socialist world to save peace and freedom and check aggression and war. But while saying this, I would also like to say that while we are fighting for peace and for non-alignment and this should be the main thrust of India's foreign policy—I would very much like to make it clear from our Party also that we have already lent our full support to the Government of India in the fight for peace and for non-alignment movement, and the fight against apartheid. We have lent full support. But while lending support, we have also observed that it is the US imperialism and their allies who are standing as the main obstacle in our fight for peace. And they are the powers which are creating problems not only for our country but also for the entire world. Now, about the Indo-US relations, in the pamphlets and book-lets published by the Government of India itself and in the Annual Report itself it is said that the Indo-US relation is not at all satisfactory and that it is getting strained. And it is not only getting strained, but I feel that it has come to such a stage that we have to more clearly define our role towards the United States and their allies. And the limitation of our Government is that whenever we talk of the United States, we relate mainly with Pakistan, that Pakistan is being helped by the United States through arms and ammunitions. And knowing fully well that Pakistan have prepared a nuclear bomb or in the process of going to get it, the Government of the United States have cleared all kinds of help, economic help and armament help to Pakistan. Madam, only two or three days back, the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senete have cleared more than two billion dollar aid to Pakistan. And they have even waived the Symington Amendment in giving aid to Pakistan. And that Amendment was an obstacle to giving aid to Pakistan since Pakistan was already involved in making an atomic bomb. This decision came out only two days back. And it also appeared in the newspapers that Mr. Natwar Singh, our Minister of State for External Affairs was in the United States. He had a talk with the auhorities there but it was all ineffective. In fact, the Foreign Relations Committee have cleared the loan. A huge loan will come to Pakistan and these AWACS and other weapons of destruction will be handed over to Pakistan. That is posing a danger to India. It is not actually posing a danger to the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union is capable of defending itself. It is mainly posing a danger to India. But I am opposed to criticising United States only in relation to Pakstan. It is a fact that Pakistan's mentor is the United States. There are no two opinions about it. It is through Pakistan that America is trying to penetrate India and destabilise India. In the Annual Report and the booklet published by the Lok Sabha on the Foreign Policy of India it has been mentioned that not only are they giving aid to Pakistan but the United States is also harbouring terrorists. Recently two conspiracies came to light in America. One comspiracy was to assassinate our Prime Minister and another conspiracy was to assassinate our former Chief Minister of Haryana. All these plots took place on the soil of America. It means America is protecting all these people who want to create destabilisation in our country, who want to assassinate, our Prime Minister and other dignitaries of this country. It is America through Pakistan and also on their very soil that they are trying to commit this mischief against India. Madam, this is one aspect of the matter. The other aspect is that besides through Pakistan—sometimes we forget to mention it—our entire security environment is endangered by American imperialism mainly through the Indian Ocean. What are the developments in the Indian Ocean today? We find that though the United States passed a Resolution as back as 1971 for declaring the Indian Ocean a Zone of Peace, subsequently this proposal could not be put into effect. Who stood in the way? It is not the Soviet Union. You say that the Indian Ocean has become a hot-bed of power rivalry between two super-powers. But what is the fact? In your Report it has been mentioned that the Indian Ocean has been a hot-bed of rivalry of two super powers, but what is the fact? Does Diego Garcia belong to the Soviet

Union or to the United States? It belongs to the United States. And this base has been srengthened by the deployment of nuclear arms, by the rapid deployment force, two lakhs of regular forces and one lakh reservists in Diego Garcia and elsewhere. Do you remember that in 1971 it was the United States, which sent the Seventh Fleet to the Indian Ocean. And, what for? They came up to Bay of Bengal when we were in a state of war with Pakistan and when Bangladesh was created. They threatened India and sent Seventh Fleet to India at that time. Not only that. Actually this whole Indian Ocean started to be militarised since the polaris missiles were invented by American imperialism and these polaris missiles were introduced and the entire Indian Ocean has been tried to be militarised by the United States. So, it is fruitless to equate these two powers, the Soviet Union and America, and say that these two powers are having rivalry and are trying to gain control of the Indian Ocean. It is actually American imperialism which is trying to gain control over the Indian Ocean and through that they want to endanger the security of India.

Not only that, Madam, we have to look into the fact that 85 per cent of our foreign trade is routed through the Indian Ocean. Once this Ocean is endangered our economy—it is not only our defence—will be ruined. If this control of Indian Ocean goes to the United States, a belligerent country, which wants to devour not only this part or that part, but wants to devour the entire world for their own domination, we must look at it from that angle instead of saying that the Indian Ocean has become a hot-bed of two super-powers, we must endeavour to see who is the culprit and we must tell people also accordingly and our foreign policy should be directed towards what is happening in the Indian Ocean.

Madam, I would like to say that when the discussion took place in Parliament on Bofors arms deal, submarine deal from West Germany or the Fairfax issue, the Government stated and the Congress Working Committee came out with a statement saying that attempts are being made to destabilise the country. But how is destabilisation coming about. I would like to say that in the Working Committee Resolution on April 18, it was stated thus: "It does not need much ingenuity to discover who stands behind Pakistan" and to the "rearming of Pakistan in consonance with its appointed role of the bastion of neo-imperialism in our part of ehe world". As if only through Pakistan it is trying to destabilise the Government. And when we discussed Bofors, the submarine deal and the Fairfax, you had talked of these attempts at destabilisation. But I would say in your own report, in the report of the External Affairs Ministry, you have mentioned that it is not only through these, but even through economic policies you say there are attempts at destabilisation. You have said in the booklet on 'Foreign Policy of India' issued by the Lok Sabha Secretariat where it is said:

> "On the economic side too, the differences in approach have been often sharp with the US not concealing its distaste for an economic growth model relying on the public sector nor its opposition to what has been seen as excessive Indian protectionism. Many of these themes continue to affect the relationship today even if they have changed somewhat in form or detail."

This is the moot point that destabilisation is coming through economic policy also. Now, what is our policy towards America? If we relate our policy to America with our own economic policy, particularly the new economic policy followed by the present Prime Minister, it is seen what you have said in this booklet that America dislikes our public sector; America dislikes our protectionism. But at the same time, our Government is trying to denigrate the public sector and minimise the public sector, and instead of protectionism, our Government is more and more relying on liberal imports. That is one side.

The other side is, our Government is bent upon inviting multinationals. And what are these multinationals? It is the American or the Japanese or the West German multinationals. What is the history of Latin America and how those

[Shri Sukomal Sen]

countries are being destabilised one after the other? Take the examples of El Salvador, Bolivia, Guatamala. It is through economic penetration that U.S. imperialism is trying to destabilise those countries. First they have enter in the economic field, there is economic penetration and then political penetration takes place leading to destabilisation. This is the history of the Latin American and other countries. So, America dislikes our public sector; it dislikes our protectionism, and at the same time we denigrate our public sector. To please whom? To please the U.S. imperialism. We liberalise imports, to please whom? To please America, or the economic institutions like the World Bank, the IMF, to get loans from them. We denigrate the public sector and we liberalise imports. So, it is a contradictory policy. I feel the Government of India should take a serious note of it and change the economic policy, because their economic policy is inviting American imperialism in our country, and that will create a base for destabilisation through American economic penetration. This gives them a political advantage and a political lever to destabilise our country. It is for India's integrity and our national unity that we should change our policy.

If we look at other things, we find that for a high technology, we are too much desirous of importing high technology from that imperialist Power. After whom are we running? We are running after the same U.S. imperialism. You have mentioned in your Working Committee Resolution. You have mentioned about Pakistan. Everybody understands who is behind Pakistan. It is the U.S. imperialiFor a high technology and for Supersm which wants to destabilise our country. Computers, we are running after the U.S. imperialism. Why are you not making efforts for a closer relationship with the Soviet world, with other Socialist countries to get high technology from that side and to increase trade with them? But we have our trade links with the U.S. imperialism and their allies, with the capitalists. Therefore, I would suggest that we should review our economic policy in this regard.

Madam, I will take a few minutes more. I now come to the question of....

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: I must speak up to lunch.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Time-limit is laid down here. You have already taken fifteen minutes.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: I would like to mention another point. This is in regard to our relations with our neighbours, with Pakistan, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka.

What is the position today in Sri Lanka? The report says that about 1,30,000 refugees have come from Sri Lanka to this side, to India. Now, every month, refugees are coming from Sri Lanka to India to take shelter here. In one word, I can describe our policy towards the Sri Lankan problem. In fact, today, we can say very confidently that the Indian Government's policy towards the Sri Lankan problem has completely flopped.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH (West Bengal): Messed up.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: We have sent so many delegations. First Mr. Natwar Singh and Mr. Chidambaram went together to Sri Lanka and held discussions. Then, certain proposals were evolved known as the December 19 proposals. Then, Mr. Dinesh Singh was sent as the special emissary of the Prime Minister. He also holds talks. He makes further proposals. As soon as they come back, the Sri Lankan Government says that they are not for the December 19 proposals. They say that the merger of the two linguistic provinces into one linguistic unit is not possible. Then, killings take place. Who kills whom, it is difficult to identity. There was the bomb blast which rocked Colombo. Nobody knows who has done it, who is the main culprit. It is not known

to the people. It is not known to the world. My point is our policy towards the Sri Lankan problem should be more specific. On the one side, killings are taking place in Sri Lanka. On the other side, we are unable to adopt a specific policy. Madam, taking advantage of the situation, a third party wants to enter the field U.S. imperialism is waiting on the wings to enter the arena. Perhaps, they have already entered the arena and creating all sorts of troubles. It is not known, who placed the bomb, how it exploded. Nobody knows who is responsible for the killings. Nobody knows whether the CIA is involved or the U.S.A. is involved. They should be identified. Otherwise, our efforts to solve the Sri Lankan problem will not be fruitful.

Another point is about our relations with Bangladesh. The report says that they have improved. But on the other side, in Tripura . . . (*Time bell rings*)

SHRI VALAMPURI JOHN (Tamil Nadu): The Government is not charitable to the Tamils in Sri Lanka. At least, you can be charitable to the Member when he is referring to the problem.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He has completed his point on Sri Lanka. He has now taken up Bangladesh. (*Interruptions*) He has moreover exceeded the time allotted to his party.

SHRI VALAMPURI JOHN: This has not been followed in other cases. The same procedure has not been followed. (*Interruptions*) For others, you have allowed more time. I can prove it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is not correct. As I said, he has completed his point on Sri Lanka and has gone on to Bangladesh. His party was allotted fourteen minutes. He has already taken fifteen minutes.

SHRI VALAMPURI JOHN: In other cases, you have allowed people to go beyond the time-limit.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. He cannot go on like this You cannot expect me to be more charitable (*Interruptions*)

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE (West Bengal): Madam, this fourteen minutes was allotted on the basis of a four-hour debate. If you can guarantee us that the debate will not go beyond four hours, he can sit down. But generally, it does not happen; the debate often gets extended. Therefore, at the minimum, we are entitled for 20 minutes. I think, arithmetically, I am right.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Minister is going to reply at 6 P.M. and before that we have to complete the speeches.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: Before lunch, I will finish. Only three minutes are left.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You cannot take double the time.

SHRI VALAMPURI JOHN: Kindly allow him.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have already given him five minutes more.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: Before I come to Bangladesh, there is one point in regard to Sri Lanka which I would like to mention. Recently, the Sri Lankan Parliament adopted a motion wherein they have taken a vow to liquidate the rebels. I would like to mention here that when this motion was adopted only one member, lone member, who opposed it was the Communist Member. He opposed the liquidation of the rebels. We should take not of it. This is a force inside Sri Lanka which is called Srilankan Communist Party. May be, it is small in number but their line of action and thinking about the ethnic issue in Sri Lanka is almost similar to that of ours. I would, therefore, request the hon. Foreign Minister to take note of this and try to approach the issue taking into account this view point also.

As regard Bangladesh, thousands of Chakma refugees are entering Tripura. It is a State with a population of only 20 lakhs and how can they entertain refugee population of over a lakh? Our relation with Bangladesh is improving. I wish we could further improve our relations with Bangladesh, but the problem of

[Shri Sukomal Sen]

Chakma refugees entering Tripura is causing a lot of hardship on the small Government of Tripura. I would request the Government to talk to Bangladesh Government. They should create an atmosphere in which the refugees could return from Tripura to Bangladesh. We cannot merely push back the refugees. We can push them back but simply pushing back will not do. They should not be pushed back to be butchered. A peaceful atmosphere should be created in Bangladesh so that the refugees could return to their home places, to their hearths and homes. In this respect, I feel our Government has failed and as a result of this failure, the Tripura Government is suffering extremely.

Madam I have been halted by you many times. So with these words I conclude.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA (Himachal Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, the House is discussing the report of a Ministry which, in fact covers vital areas of our security, our defence and the foreign policy of the present Govt. Government has consistently pursued the goals which were set forth immediately after India's independence by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, who was the first leader in the word, to take up the cause of the down-trodden and oppressed humanity. This Government has pursued the policy of giving further momentum, further strength to the Non-aligned movement. We have emerged as a leading spokesman of all those who have been denied fundamental human rights. We are steadfast in our struggle against colonialism. The Government deserves to be complimented for pursuing a policy which is realistic, which is bold and which is in the interest of India, in the interest of the developing world as a whole. The Non-aligned movement has been the focus of our foreign policy. Rightly so, because we are one of the founders and leaders of this movement. Till September 1986 we were the chairman of this movement and as chairman of Non-aligned movement, the performance of India has been commended by all member-countries. Under India's chairmanship this movement did acquire new thrust. The Non-aligned movement could take up effectively those issues which were concerning the people in Asia, in Africa and in Middle East. The movement has certainly gained in prestige and has followed the right direction, the desired direction. It is not confined merely to political issues, not to rhetoric, not to idle statements but the movement has definitely taken up practical measures to ensure that for those people for whom the movement speaks, they feel the assistance which is given by the movement.

For this I may specifically refer to...

SHRI KALPNATH RAI (Uttar Pradesh): Lunch.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Not to lunch.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Will you finish just now?

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: I think I will continue after lunch. Even I am being distracted because of the thought that we have to adjourn now for lunch.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 22.30 P.M.

The HoHuse then adjournde for lunch at thirty-one minute past one of the clock.

The House reassembled aftar lunch at thirty-two minutes past tfwo of the clock, **The Vice-Chairman (Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal)** in the Chair.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: Sir, I was referring to India's role as Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement and the issues which were taken up very effectively during our chairmanship. Being the leader of those nations which have been colonized for centuries, which had been exploited and whose economies were ravaged, the Movement has rightly taken up the economic issues, calling for a new international economic order and also for South-South cooperation. At the Harare summit, as we all had expected, the issue of apartheid

and the barbaric actions of the racist Pretoria regime dominated the summit. India has been consistent in its opposition to apartheid. We have always been in the forefront of the struggle. We have lent our strong voice of support for those who have been fighting for fundamental human rights in South Africa and Namibia. All the frontline States have, because of their moral support to the liberation movement, because of their opposition to the Pretoria regime, have been subjected to a propaganda onslaught, to a military onslaught, by the Pretoria regime.

Realizing that the frontline States have been under pressure, India has raised its voice and called for support to the frontline States besides the people of South Africa and Namibia. Our Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi, has today emerged as a leading crusader of this struggle. His voice has been the loudest whether it was at Nassau or New York or the mini-summit of the Commonwealth countries. He has effectively taken up the issue of comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa. At the Harare summit also the Heads of States of the non-aligned countries deliberated on the subject. The decision to create the AFRICA Fund and the election of India as its Chairman is something very significant because the Movement has come up to give practical assistance to those countries which are under pressure. We have made a very categorical declaration on what we stand for and also on our intention to further intensify the struggle. The election of India is not a mean achievement. It is not something which can be termed as a routine matter. It only reflects the high esteem in which our country is held, in which the Prime Minister is held by the African countries and by the Non-aligned Movement as such.

Sir, we can only hope that the action programme which has been adopted at Harare, results in creating a new awareness and finds support elsewhere so that the aims are fulfilled and what we have been striving for a long time is achieved.

Our relations with the socialist world are also a very important component of our foreign policy. I would not like to dwell more on that. As has been said in the report also, our relations have been good. We value the friendship with the socialist countries. And on major world issues our thinking has been alike.

I may only refer to the visit of the Soviet General Secretary Gorbachev to India and the signing of the New Delhi Declaration. This is a very important document. It has been hailed all over the world. India and the Soviet Union combined together represent one-fifth of humanity. And the commitment of the two leaders, committing the two countries, committing the people of the two countries to a world which is free from violence, free from the threat of nuclear weapons, is indeed commendable. It has always been our endeavour to promote peace and disarmament, to mobilise world opinion in that direction. It is something which in important.

When we talk of peace, we need not talk of peace in our immediate neighbourhood. we should not talk of peace only for ourselves. With the world inching towards nuclear catastrophe, India has an important role to play to ensure that disarmament becomes a reality and the nuclear weapons which are threatening the very existence of mankind, are done away with. Unfortunately, we do not find this thing emerging in the near future because of the failure of the summit between President Reagan and General Secretary, Mr. Gorbachev at Reykjavik But even then it should not result in disappointment. We must nurture hope and must pursue with all our might this important mission.

Sir, there have been activities which are detrimental to our interests being carried out elsewhere outside India particularly in the western countries. For a long time there has been a campaign against this country. There have been attempts to destabilise this country which are apparently aimed at misleading the people in those countries about the reality in India.

But the Government has very effectively taken up this issue. The efforts have yielded positive results. I may mention the signing of the extradition treaty with Canda and the manner in which the cross-

[Shri Anand Sharma]

cution of those who have been carrying out anti-India activities has been initiated by the Governments of U.K. and the United States Administration. But in view of the fact that for a long time these activities have been permitted and in some cases encouraged and keeping in view the present situation, it is important that the Government takes up the question of signing an extradition treaty with the United Kingdom and even with the United States of America.

It has been the right policy of our Government to promote an atmosphere of cooperation and peace in our immediate neighbourhood. The Government has tried its best in a sincere manner to promote relations with its neighbours—Pakistan, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka. And through SAARC, which has definitely given a new momentum to regional cooperation, we have tried to promote cooperatin with these countries. Unfortunately, in some cases the response has been negative. The response is not poor. In the case of Pakistan, if I mmay so, they have not responded to our gestures. It appears as if they are not interested in peace. They have done everything possible to promote tension. But for that it is the military regime there which is to blame. If there has been a failure anywhere, the blame lies with them. It is their resonsibility. The manner in which they have piled up sophisticated weapons, received massive assistance from other countries and are pursuing nuclear weapons programme, it constitutes a serious threat to this country. It is not an issue which can merely be discussed and then forgotten. We have to take a serious note of the situation. I am not here to say that we have to go in for any confrontation, but we will have to reconsider our own options; we will have to reconsider our own nuclear policy keeping in view these developments in Pakistan and also mounting tension in the Indian Ocean with the new Naval bases being set up and the expansion of the existing bases it constitutes a very serious threat to this country.

The type of assistance and aid which Pakistan has received in the recent past from the United States of America has to be considered seriously by our policy framers. What has happened is it is against the policy of USA to give arms assistance to a nation which is going in for nuclear weapons not only have they tried to equate India's security requirements with Pakistan, but on the other hand they have also used every possible trick to ensure that instability, tension and disputes develop in this region. They have invoked the symington waiver clause to give 4.2 billion dollar assistance to Pakistan. on the other hand they have tried to impose cuts—though no final decision has been taken—on the meagre aid, not arms aid, which, in any case, was promised for India. It is very humiliating. They have tried to dictate us on our foreign policy. They have also said that in view of India's stand on various world issues they may cut the assistance which is to be given to this country. India has always pursued an independent and realistic policy. And if this attempt has been made, then, keeping in view their actions and the assistance to Pakistan, I urge upon the Government to reject this offer of aid. We must refuse it in the present circumstances and in the present situation as they are dictating terms to us. Sir, I am sure (*Time bell rings*) that the Government of India which has steadfastly pursued an independent foreign policy and taken up those issues which have been dear to us and dear to all those who believe in peace and in development, will continue to effectively pursue these goals.

But before I conclude Sir, I would like to refer to the situation on the Sino-Indian border which is a matter of serious concern to us. It is a situation which requires to be dealt with patience, diplomacy and also with caution. We cannot but express our serious concern over the recent threats which have been there, the actions of China last year their intrusion into the Indian territory and the false accusations which have been made against India of nibbling at their territory. We would like to know the assessment of our Ministry of External Affairs about this situation and about Chinese intension. May I know from the Minister whether there is a build-up across the border? Are these accusations a prelude to

another invasion? We are hopeful that in view of the declared policy of our Government to settle all disputes through negotiations we will persuade them, impress upon them and try our best to solve these disputes in a peaceful manner so that the peace in this region is not disturbed. But here there is an attempt to create instability and peace is threatened in the Indian sub continent. We must be aware of the designs of those who are upset because of India's independent foreign policy, India's stability. Indias strength, India's leadership of the non-aligned movement and may be that both these nations are being used as a spring board of destabilisation.

Sir, I wil conclude by saying that this nation ought to be proud of the foreign policy pursued by this Government. The manner in which India has taken up effectively various issues at world forum and high esteem in which leader of this nation, Prime Minister, Shri Rajiv Gandhi is held all over the world is respected by all. Thank you.

SHRI VALAMPURI JOHN: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir. Mr. Anand Sharma was eloquent in his assertion that India's foreign policy is such that it takes care of the suffering humanity wherever it exists. But at the same time with all his poetic impulse, it is only partialy true. It may be true elsewhere but not in Sri Lanka. Again he observed very cryptically that India promotes peace everywhere in the world but I would like to add only a few words, yes, Mr. Sharma is right that India promotes peace everywhere in the world except in India. What happens here is, I am so unhappy . . .

SHRI GHAN SHYAM SINGH (Uttar Pradesh): We are discussing foreign policy.

SHRI VALAMPURI JOHN: I am quite conscious that we are discussing foreign policy. I am not happy to say that India's foreign policy has fumbled and failed but I must say it has failed miserably in Sri Lanka. When I say this nothing would be more apt and appropriate than to quote what Mr. Venkateswaran, the former Foreign Secretary has said yesterday. It has appeared in the 'Hindu' of April 26, 1987. I quote:

> "He said that the Indian foreign policy lacked consistency and credibility, as quick solutions and instant fixes were attempted. Everything is still being sought to be done in fits and starts, leading to a general state of drift in the situation. He said that the Central Government was not as sensitive to the problems of the southern States as to those of the northern heartland. Had any linguistic group of north India been persecuted like the Tamils in Sri Lanka, the Central Government would have certainly reacted more decisively."

This is a charge of Mr. Venkateswaran, the former Foreign Secretary.

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव (बिहार): यह बिल्कुल गलत है । उत्तर भारत में भी पाकिस्तान से आये हुए शरणार्थी छम्ब और जोरिया में पिछले 12 सालों से पड़े हैं । बंगला देश से चकमा लोगों को भगाया जा रहा है और नेपाल में बिहारियों के साथ ऐसा होना शुरू हो गया है । इसलिए उनकी भी वही हालत है जो श्रीलंका में तमिल भाषियों की है ।

SHRI VALAMPURI JOHN: I am only quoting what he has said. If the Foreign Secretary of the Government could say this, then what is your answer? Because this is the gravest charge possible. I do not think that anybody of his level has made such a serious charge, the gravest charge possible. What I understand is what he was not able to say when he was the Foreign Secretary, he has been able to say now and he has come out with the truth. This is the gravest charge possible and the whole country and the whole world will listen to it. He was your own Foreign Secretary. He says, suppose a northern linguistic group had been affected, the Government of India would have come to their security immediately but not to these people; this is our feeling too and we assertively say that he is echoing our sentiments. Now, I understand for the first time why he has been dropped like a hot potato.

[Shri Yalampuri John]

We have been saying in the same House that whoever exhibits the Tamil instincts foolishly in the foreign office is not safe. It has been again amplified and proved by his statement here. Further he pointed out that atrocities perpetrated against the three million Tamils in Sri Lanka are a cause for serious concern to the Tamils everywhere. But their aspirations are not understood by our Central Government. The only correction is that it is not that you are not understanding. I don't charge that you are not understanding but after having understood the situation, you are not acting. You refuse to act. This is the difficulty. I have been requesting for a proper action for the last three years for eradication of state terrorism in Sri Lanka but you are harping repeatedly on one thing. Even day before yesterday, you said the same thing. You have been harping on the same thing. You simply condemn violence in Sri Lanka. But I ask a very pertinent question to you, don't you think it is not simply a violence? It is a sweeping generalization to say that it is violence. By doing so, you are making a kind of an approach which is very wrong in its very texture. You are equating offenders as well as the defenders. You are equating an accused as well as the one who has been affected. As Mr. Sukomal Sen correctly said, when you speak of the super power rivalry, there you are equating United States with Soviet Union. When the United States has got a power base there, when they are insisting and making potential threat to the Indian security, Soviet Union has no base at all but you are equating both and say that it is a super power rivalry in very flowery phrases, you are completely avoiding the issue and you are totally indifferent. As such now you are equating state terrorism, the military racist regime on the one hand and defenceless people, armless people on the other hand. How are you equating both of them? Why do I say so? See for days together, for the last five days, they are showering bombs. There are air raids on the people. Can you give me an instance where there had been a continuous air raid by a Government in the history of the world against its own people? The Government cannot make this kind of air raid against its own people but it is continued. But you come and say that you are condemning this violence. It is not violence. This is resistance movement by Tamils in self-defence. When cats are provided with claws by nature can you deny the same kind of 'privilege', the same kind of protective mechanism to Tamils? What nature has provided to cats, can you deny it to Tamils? This is what my question is. They are resisting them. It is not violence as you say. From 1956, from the time of Mr. Bandaranayake', Only the Sinhala Act, they are committing violence against the presence of Tamils. The violence is against the Tamil language, the violence is against Tamil culture, the violence is against Tamil ethos; and it is coninuing for such a long time, from 1956 to 1987. There has been so much of violence and it is that which has resulted in this kind of LTTE and EROs. They are the vanguard of the revolutionary forces. They are resisting them. And you call their resistence violence! You cannot equate the offender and the offended, one who has been totally affected, the defenceless people and say "We condemn violence". When you say "We are condemning violence", whose violence are you condemning? You are not acting as a mediator. You are not serious. You are totally indifferent. Why do you again and again say in your handouts "We are condemning violence"? Whose violence are you condemning? There is State terrorism; there is racist regime. Its behaviour is worse, than what we find in South Africa. At least in South Africa Nelson Mandela and his friends are safe in prison. But Sri Lanka is the only country in the world where even the prisoners are not safe in their prisons. You have seen the widespread reports published in the *Sun*, the Government-owned newspaper in Sri Lanka which said, Sinhalese prisoners are going on fast. For what? Because, a Sinhalese crowd was not allowed to kill Tamil prisoners, because they were not allowed to kill Tamil prisoners in other Sri Lankan jails. That is why they were going on a fast. Such is the situation created by the racist regime in Sri Lanka. What I want to say is you always sermonise on the situation in Sri Lanka. In other places you could show your priorities, in other places you could act. For example, in South Africa you are presiding over the

Africa Fund. I have nothing to say there. India is behaving well. India is galvanising all the forces. I do not dispute it. But in Sri Lanka you have miserably failed What you can do for a distant country — for example, for Palestinian guerillas you are again and again extending your hand—you are not doing in a nearby situation. Why are you silent, why are you indifferent, towards the Tamil people in Sri Lanka? The racist regime is liquidating the Tamil masses. Do you think that it will become a global war? If it becomes a global war, India should fight it. I remember an occasion when the Chinese aggression took place and Acharya Kripalani said something and in reply Jawaharlal Nehru said, "India is like a mighty elephant. *It takes time to* stand up; but the moment it stands up, it stands completely and mightily." But today what is the position of India's foreign policy? No one takes you seriously. You are not a mediator. The reason is simple. Prema Dasa, the Prime Minister, stated in a different way; he said a few words. He said, "Whoever advocates political settlement at this hour when our own people are affected, they are our enemies." And the honourable Minister here comes and says in the Lok Sabha, "If it is true...". This has been published by Government-owned newspaper, *The Sun*. Nothing can be more instilling than this. A Government-owned newspaper in Sri Lanka brings a statement of its Prime Minister Prema Dasa, "Whoever advocates peace at this hour is our enemy". It goes to prove that India is "our enemy". He has declared openly, "India is my enemy". When somebody has declared "India is my enemy", you are keeping quiet. That goes to prove that you are not taking this problem seriously. There are two nations in Sri Lanka. You must accept it first. There are two nations in the island. My only concern is having understood, having appreciated, this problem that there are two nations in Sri Lanka, you refuse to act. Why? There are two nations because it is a racist regime which is bombarding its own people, there are so many air-raids. Sri Lankan Government has been repeatedly saying to you that these air-raids are aimed at only mopping up these Tigers, freedom fighters. Is it true? What I am saying is there is economic blockade against Jaffna Peninsula; there is communication blockade against Jaffna Peninsula; supply of fuel has been completely stopped. Is it then against freedom fighters or against Tamil people? Against whom is this economic blockade? I am asking a simple question. In the wisdom of this Government, is it a measure against the freedom fighters who are Tigers or against the Tamil people? It is against the Tamil people. That is why these things are happening. I cannot understand your repeated saying, "Violence, violence, violence". How can you equate the offender and the affected? May be, there is one reason and that is Delhi's mind is overexercised on the bomb blast in Colombo. So, the bomb blasts in Colombo are not the handiwork of the *3.00 P.M. Tigers, but of the Israelis. This* is not my revelation and this is not my party's revelation and this is not the finding of the Tamil people. In the Sri Lankan Parliament, the Opposition leaders, the MPs of the Opposition, have said this and for having said so, they have been physically removed the day before yesterday! They have said and they have said it very clearly that this is not the work of the Tigers, but it is the work of the Israelis and they have said that this is the inside work, the inside game, with Israeli hands. These are the very words which they have used. So, the MPs there have said this and for saying so, they have been physically removed. So, when the Opposition MPs themselves say that the Tigers are not responsible for his, that this is the handiwork of the Government, why are you getting yourself overexercised over this particular affair? I can understand your ob-session to the Opposition parties in India. But why are you not taking in the right spirit what the Opposition says, not in your land, but in some other land, when they say this? Why are you mixing up a foreign Opposition with the native Opposition? I can understand why this bomb blast has come now. Because it is a racist regime. Last year, at the same time, the same kind of bomb blast was there. There is madness there, but there is method in heir madness. Last year, at about the same time, the same thing occurred. Last year, there was the seven-country meet in Tokyo and they wanted to get the support of the AID Consortium countries and that was why they were planning it, only to emphasize

[Shri Valampuri John]

their stand and only to get the support of the AID Consortium countries. Again now, from today, the fourteenth day, there is a meeting, the AID Consortium meeting is on and now they have to go and tell them that they have to get the international community's support for their acts and that is why they are planning it. Why are you overexercised? Again I would like to tell you one thing. Unless and until you accept the basic thing—it is not merely a theory, but it is a basic lesson of history—that there are two nations in Sri Lanka and they can never live together, you cannot do anything. They can never live together. They say that they are the followers of Buddhism. But what happens there? We read from history that Buddha, the great soul, left his palace, left his wealth and left everything just on seeing a corpse. If the great Buddha could have seen the hundreds of thousands of corpses in Sri Lanka now, he would have left the whole universe. What worries me is this: Even the other day, on the Maha Shivarathri day, a lot of Hindu temples were desecrated. A lot of Hindu temples and idols in the sanctum sanctorum were desecrated. But I am sorry to say one thing. I was born to Christian parents; I have no religion; I am an orphan. But I ask you one thing: Why the Hindu conscience is in deep slumber? When we feel so much, why are they in deep slumber? I have seen the Hindu religious heads here shedding tears, seen them showing anguish, whenever they read or hear that there was invasion, invasion by the Moguls, centuries back and that many Hindu temples and idols were destroyed. While you are condeming what is reported to have happened centuries back, why are you keeping mum now? Through this forum I am asking all the Hindus here: Why are you keeping mum? While you are condemning such incidents in the past history, condemning what happened centuries back, why are you keeping mum when your temples have been destroyed, when the idols have been desecrated or when your priests are killed in the sanctum sanctorum as if before your very eyes. Why are you not reacting? The reason is that even religion, I feel, is conditioned by ethnicity here. Religion, in this country, is bing limited by language and religious is being confined by area. This is what I would like to say emphatically. I would like to quote one thing now.

Now, economic blockade was the reason why the Tigers did not come for talks. In Delhi, this is the way a kind of admosphere is being created as if the Tigers are not freedom fighters and were not prepared for talks. It is not true. You have to come out with a statement saying whether they were prepared or not prepared for talks. They were prepared for talks. But what was the condition? They said that the economic blockade must go, that the tele-communication blockade must go and that the fuel supply must be restored. Only when you restore these things, they will come for the talks. This is the only thing they are telling But when these three conditions were not fulfilled, now can the Government of India ask them to come for talks? Therefore, I would like to tell you that if you do not help them, some other country will help them and you will become our enemies. I am pained to see that you take the position that Sri Lanka becomes a potential threat. It is not a potential threat from the deep south in Sri Lanka with American mercenaries and Israeli massads. You are introducing, knowingly, a kind of destabilizing element in India's body politic. I say this because, as far as Sri Lanka is concerned, it is not an external affair, but, it is an internal problem for India. But when the people in Tamil Nadu feel that they are let down, and if you do not react today, let me tell you—let me go on record—you may see only the ripples today, but some day Tamil Nadu will become another Punjab. Tamil Nadu will become a Punjab, because our people feel that they have been let down. Their kith and kin are killed. If it happens to a linguistic group in the north you will act. But not for the Tamils. Our kith and kin are being killed daily. It is infernal massacre. It is total conflagration. But the Government of India is looking into it. It says: we are condemning violence, go for talks. Nothing will happen. Never will it happen.

It is not a question of threat from deep south, from Sri Lanka. It is a threat from within the country, because we say that our people have been let down. We may not ask, we may not demand. But can we say to the history: you should not go this way? I cannot condition history. In the past this has happened. The sons and daughters who have been butchered... (*Time bell rings*) One lakh and forty-five thousand. Who is destabilizing this country? You accuse American arms. But are you not destabilising the country? By not helping the Tamils you are destabilising the country. Unless and until—and it is not warning because a warning will not solve the problem... (*Time bell rings*) One minute. Earlier Mr. Jayawardene was saying, when India was the mediator very seriously he said: India is a giant. After a year I found, I have calculated, he said: India is a big brother. Now he says: India is an enemy. This is where our foreign policy has totally bungled. You have to come up with effective measures. I do not say you have to invade them. It is not necessary. It is a small, tiny island and invasion is too big a word for Sri Lanka. But a giant like India is being completely heckled by a jackal. Why does it happen? Why do you allow this to happen? Are you not answerable to the people, why don't you answer the people. They say that definitely the Government of India has let them down, and that is why these things happen. But you are not heading for the day. The Government of India and the whole Cabinet, the whole set-up, have to heed for the day. History will have the strongest condemnation, having fully realised, fully understood, that the Government did not help the Tamils beceuse you believed that the Tamils are second-class citizens in this country.

SHRI BHUVNESH CHATURVEDI (Rajasthan): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to you for giving me an opportunity to participate in the debate.

On this occasion I will like to remind the House that forty years ago in March and April 1947 India hosted the first Asian Relations Conference. At that time India was not free. Pt. Jawaharlal was the Vice-Chairman of Viceroys' Executive Council. So before independence, India had a foreign policy and, therefore, we organised the Asian Relations Conference. We tried to project the Asian identity on the world scene. The resurgence of Asia was the call of the hour. I would like to quote from the speech delivered by Pt. Nehru, one or two paragraphs, to show what was the basis of our foreign policy on which the edifice is now growing steadily and strongly. He said—I quote:

> "Asia, after a long period, has suddenly become an important country in world affairs. If we view the millennium of history, this Continent of Asia was intimately connected in cultural fellowship, has played a mighty role in the evolution of humanity. There was widespread urge and awareness that the time had come for us, peoples of Asia, to meet together, to hold together, and to advance together. It was not only a vague desire, but the compulsion of events forced all of us to think along these lines."

And he concluded:

> "This conference itself is significant as an expression of that deeper urge of the mind and spirit of Asia. We propose to stand on our own legs and cooperate with all others who are prepared to cooperate with us. We do not intend to be plathings of others. The countries of Asia can no longer he used as pawns by others. They are bound to have their own policies in world affairs."

He concluded:

> "In this atomic age Asia will have to function effectively in the maintenance of peace."

Sir, that was foreseen by a great visionary, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and today we see what we have achieved in our foreign policy and what was our foundation in the foreign policy. Sir, I

[Shri Bhuvnesh Chaturvedi]

will not speak on every aspect of the foreign policy because it is very difficult to cover every aspect in a very short period. But I will like to touch only three points. One is about our policy in regard to neighbouring countries, the other is China and the third is America-Pakistan nexus.

Sir, Chanakaya has said much earlier that it is very difficult to have a very friendly neighbour. Things have changed and the contexts have changed. But at the same time, we must see our limitations. We must see the geographical compulsions and how we can have a friendly neighbour, especially when that neighbour is merely a proxy of a big power. So, we can understand that a small neighbouring country is acting as a proxy of a big power. We are not to persuade that neighbour. We have to persuade that big power to come to senses. The other country is Nepal. We can understand the traditional friendship with Nepal. They try to break it because they want to operate outside the old influence, the traditional influence. They want to gain their own personality. Whatever we have given them was out of our love and brotherhood for that country and not out of generosity. They misunderstand us. There are dissidents with various political opinions. They try to paint us as a big brother or as a coloniser. We are trying to be very friendly and we are working honestly, sincerely and really to build up that country. But there is a conflict of public opinion and they paint us in a very different way. So, this is the thing.

The other country is Bangladesh. Who does not know that we have actively assisted and helped them to create a nation. They remember us very fondly and affectionately till the days of Mujib. But the destabilisation of Bangladesh has changed the situation altogether and the power forces inside and outside are trying to paint us in the same way as we are being misunderstood in other countries. This is my submission in brief. As Chanakya says—and it is very true even today—it is very difficult to be friendly with an unfriendly neighbour. We have to realise it. Deep suspicions are involved. Transfer of population is involved. Other economic offences like smuggling are involved. These are the realities. We have to be very practical in creating a sound neighbourhood policy.

That is why, sometimes our friends and critics say that we have not been able to evolve a policy by which every neighbour and every neighbouring country becomes our friend. But these are the inherent contradictions. We must realise it as a neighbouring country.

My second point is China. We have seen those days of Hindi-Chini Bhai Bhai. We have seen those days of Dr. Kotnis. We have seen those days of 1962. On the one side, there is a resolution of the Parliament. That is a commitment to the nation or a commitment of the people's representatives to the people of India. It says that no territory will be surrendered and every inch of the territory will be recovered from China. On the one side, this is the situation. On the oher side, after 25 or 26 years, there is a change in world forces. America was against China. In those days, America was very enthusiastic to support us against China. They were rather prompting us without our seeking help from them. Now, the scenario has changed. Now America is very friendly and intimate to them. And with the help of Pakistan, China and America are trying to destabilise us. But at the same time neither we can surrender our territory nor can we wage a war to retain that territory. Now it is a very difficult choice before the nation. What to do? My submission is that we must honestly admit that during the last 25 years we have not been able to evolve a clear-cut foreign policy towards China. Nobody, no one sitting in the foreign office can create a foreign policy towards China or a China policy. My submission is that some serious thought should be given and some very practical propositions should be evolved as to deal with China. We have no options.

We have very limited options while dealing with China. Therefore, my submission is that great patience and statesmanship are required to deal with China. Neither we can wage a war against China nor can we surrender or compromise the territory against our national interest. No Government can survive after surrendering its territory nor is it practical to wage a war against China and regain the territory. That is why my submission is that great patience is required, and at the same time the statesmanship of a very high order is required. Sometimes somebody feels that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru failed, Mrs. Indira Gandhi has failed, so many Foreign Ministers have failed, so many Foreign Secretaries have failed, but I will do it. That is a false ego. No individual howsoever capable, intellectual and honest can deliver the goods. No individual can bring China to senses. Therefore, my submission is that is is a very, very delicate affair, and we should deal with China very cautiously, and we should evolve a China policy to be implemented in a decade or two when normal relations are to be established.

Now, Sir, I deal with the United States. (*Time bell rings*) Sir, I will conclude in just three or four minutes. About the United States, I would like to submit that a very realistic exercise has to be done on Indo-US relations. High-sounding words that we are the largest democracies or that we are inspired by the same ideals of liberty or that we have transplanted the fundamental rights from the US soil to the Indian soil are all false slogans. We should not remain in a myth. This is just a wishful thinking. All these common points are very superfluous, and if we try to build up our relationship with the US on this, then we will be living in a fool's paradise. Sir, I mak a submission that the startegic dimensions set by the US assigned for it a pre-eminent role in our region. That is the first consideration which we will have to weigh. What plans the US have of its role in this region? It wants to have its hegemony over all the small and big powers? Can we play that role? Certainly we cannot. Therefore, it is very difficult to come to terms with the United States of America on its strategic considerations or strategic policies. We must rather honestly accept that India is very inconvenient to the United States in their world strategy. Therefore, unless they changed totally, they cannot be very friendly to us. Since 1947, the first Prime Minister of India, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru tried his best to be friendly to them. Thereafter, all successive Prime Ministers, in their first term of office tried to be friendly with the USA. But what happened? Unfortunately, after the initial romance of love or just a courtesy, the myth exploded and they started almost war-like preparations against us. And the second point is that the Jewish factor in the US domestic policy influences the American foreign policy. We must never minimise this Jewish influence on the American foreign policy because they are the merchants of war. They are only interested in war in one country or the other. It should continue to be a world phenomenon. Then only the Jews can Survive. The Jews have a definite influence. No President, howsoever strong he may be in America(can operate or can act or can do anything without their support. He cannot disown the Jewish lobby. That is the cardinal situation that India should not misunderstand. That is the American strategy for the world and that is the effect of the internal Jewish influence on their foreign policy. Unless we are able to break that, unless we are able to create public opinion in America against the Jews, we cannot proceed further. Sir, I would like to submit that America is a society of lobbies. So, if Jewish lobby is there, fortunately lobbies of Japan they are creating havoc with American Jewish policy. We must cultivate them. There are sufficient number of Indians, Indian citizens, who are in powerful positions. They are intellectuals of the first order, businessmen of the first order. So, we must develop Indian lobby or any other lobby which acts against Jewish lobby and they can be encouraged to come up in one or two years. And at the time of the Presidential elections we can develop a very influential pro-Indian lobby which

[Shri Bhuvnesh Chaturvedi]

can at any time give a tilt to the American policy towards us. These are my submissions on three or four points and in another two or three minutes I would like to conclude.

Sir, I would like to suggest that a regionwise special study in our foreign ministry or foreign office should be done. The Minister may or may not accept. But I would like to submit that there is a lack of seriods learning, seriols research and serious study in the foreign office for the last one decade or so. We must start this honestly regionwise. Then only can we evolve a very sound policy towards various regions. Let us, therefore, try to develop and expertise on various regions specially with those with which we are directly involved.

Sir, I started with the Asian Relations Conference and I would like to request the Minister to convey our deep desire to the Government to have the 14th Anniversary of this Asian Relations Conference this year. I remember I was there as a student worker. Khan Abdul Gha-Ghaffar Khan adderssed that. By chance there was a person in Beijing when I visited a week before, there was one person who attended the Asian Relations Conference. I understand there are many Asians. If you invite those people who attended Asian relations conference and recommend our resolve for a resurgent Asia, it will certainly balance the world forces. I conclude with these words and I hope that my request will receive all consideration.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, we are now discussing the working of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, when we look at the world and we look at our neighbours, when we see our forefathers who saw the conception of the world as a society and our relations with the neighbours, and now when we see at present tht we strive for peace, for disarmament, for development, we believe in these principles, n spite of all this when we see our relations with the neighbours, we are sadly disappointed. Our foreign policy has been most ineffective uninsptring and it lacked initiative. The whole policy has been most ineffective Ininspir- Why? Because the people who are at the helm of the Government are not serious to see what really they want to do, how they want to tackle the problems concerning the people and the relations with the Governments surrounding our country. Take the question of our relations with Pakistan. We have very good relations with other countries. What about our neighbours? Take Pakistan, or Ceylon or China. The real situation is very alarming and very depressing. Pakistan was created on the two-nation theory and as per the Instrument of Accession, the whole of Jammu and Kashmir had acceded to India. But after that due to the invasion of tribes from Pakistan side a part of Kashmir has been in illegal occupation of Pakistan. And still that question is hanging on. In spite of Simla Agreement, Pakistan has been raising this issue in every forum, whether it is the Islamic Conference or the international organisation or the UNO. Everywhere they want to raise this issue. I would like to know from the foreign Minister who is also very much related to all these developments because he is one of the freedom-fighters and has seen all the developments from the beginning to this day, as to what the solution is with regard to Jammu and Kashmir. General Zia, recently in the Pakistan Parliament had said that there cannot be any real friendship with India until and Inless Kashmir issue is solved. What is that real issue? The real issue is to see that illegal occupation of Kashmir by Pakistan is vacated. That is the only issue which the Government of India should bring to the notice of Pakistan and the United Nations. But the Government of India has failed to bring this to the notice of the Pakistan Government and Security Council and to the notice of the world. The Government of India has failed to mobilise and create a public opinion. Everytime we say Pakistan is violating Simla Agreement. That is all. What is the violation and how long will you wait? It has already taken us 40

years. In 1947, Kashmir acceded to India and it was invaded by Pakistan in 1947 and till this day, a part of it is in illegal occupation of Pakistan. Not only that, a large part of occupied Kashmir has been handed over to China by Pakistan, China has built roads from Karakoram linking Sinkiang. I would like to know what steps are being taken to put an end to these actions. Simply sending protest notes is not enough. You send protests to Pakistan and to China. But no action. Have you thought over the matter? You slept over when Aksaichin was invaded and a long road was built linking Sinkiang to Tibet, and you woke up one fine morning and said, no, it belongs to us. Vast area of Indian territory has been occupied by China. In 1962, China occupied a large portion of the Indian territory. We are surrounded by all these hostile neighbours. Even now, China claims that we are interfering or we are concentrating our troops on the Chinese border. But the position is just the contrary. As a matter of fact, it has been stated that China is marching its troops on the Tibetan border. In Tibet, China has got —in addition to millions of Chinese civilians—five lakh troops stationed there. This creates a very dangerous situation so far as India is concerned. It is said that possesion of Tibet is one of major strategic importance to China. Control over the Tibetan plateau not only provides a convenient buffer to protect Western China but also a commanding position in Central and Southern Asia, giving China a direct access to enter Indian subcontinent, according to some analysts. This is what the experts on China say. I would like to know from the hon. Minister, how he is going to solve the problem. China says that large areas of Arunachal Pradesh belong to them. Recently, China intruded into Arunachal Pradesh, in what is known as the Sumdurong Chu valley in Tawang district of Arunachal Pradesh. They also built a helipad. When a question was put to the then Foreign Minister, he expressed his ignorance. He denied that any helipad had been built. Within two or three days, a statement was made in the Lok Sabha that the Chinese did intrude into Arunachal Pradesh and that they had built a helipad. This is the position. This shows our inaction, our ignorance and our helplessness. In such a situation, how can we expect that this Government is going to protect our territory and our people. This is unexplainable. I would like to know from the hon. Minister how he is going to tackle these issues.

In fact, we committed a greatest blunder when the late Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, took the Kashmir issue to the Security Council. The great General Cariappa, recently said that if this issue had not been taken to the Security Council and no ceasefire order was made and if the Indian Army had been allowed, within a week, the whole of Kashmir would have been in the hands of India because it had legally acceded to India. Then, there would have been no Kashmir issue at all and there would have been no wars between India and Pakistan. Three times Pakistan invaded us. Now, there is a USA-Pakistan-China axis. They have joined together. The question is, how you are going to change the situation. Another greatest blunder committed by Mr. Nehru in those days was recognition of China's suzerainty over Tibet, without analysing and settling the boundary issue between China and Tibet. As long as Tibet was an independent country, there arose no boundary question between China and India. When we recognised the suzerainty of China over Tibet, immediately, we had to face the question of boundary between China and India. Now, these two issues kashmir and boundry problems with China are hanging on our head and I do not know how the Government is going to solve these two issues.

In this connection, I would like to make two suggestions. We should categorically tell both Pakistan and China that whatever territory is in their illegal possession should be vacated. We do not want even an inch of either the Chinese or the Pakistani territory. But whatever belonging to us should come to us. After the Chinese invasion in 1962 our Parliament passed a Resolution that whatever territory annexed by China should be returned to India. We have to remember

[Shri B. Sabyanarayan Reddy]

that. We cannot forget that. This is one suggestion.

My second suggestion is that we should work for a confederation of India, Pakistan and Bangladesh with common defence and foreign policy. (*Time bell rings*) If we take these steps we may have real and lasting peace and friendship among these three countries in the region. After all, all these three countries are part of the same sub-continent. There is also the issue of Chakma refugees from Bangladesh. Thousands of Chakma refugees have fled from Bangladesh and have taken refuge in Tripura, India. Their properties have been destroyed and occupied in Bangladesh, by the Army. Even women and children have been massacred. They are afraid of going back to Bangladesh. I would like to know from the hon. Minister how we are going to solve this problem, how we are going to convince the Bangladesh Government to see that the Chakmas get confidence and are able to return back to their country in honour and dignity, get back their property and live in peace.

Now, I would like to mention about he happenings in Sri Lanka. Really, genocide is going on. After the Indian ediatory efforts which led to talks betveen the Sri Lankan Government and ie leaders of the liberation movements f the Tamils we thought that some olution would come out but Jayawarana Government seems to be insincere, resident Jayawardana is a man of two ngues. He says something and does mething else. The Prime Minister of i Lanka, Shri Prema Dasa, in Srilanka rliament has said that whoever now lks of political settlement or political lution, will be considered the greatest emy of his country. That means, if dia stands for a political settlement, if dia is pleading for political solution, will be considered as the biggest ene- of Sri Lanka. This is the position. ousands and thousands of Tamil thren are being killed. Their property been destroyed. There is no hope of peace coming back in that part of country. I want to know, how long are you going to preach this philosophy of negotiation? Now it is time that you take stern action. I do not know what kind of action you are going to take. Neither Ceylon, nor Pakistan nor China think that you are capable of taking any stern action. They think that you are a man of words, not a man of action. This is the opinion the world over. It is not enough to ask Jayewardene to come to negotiating terms. That is of no use. The Government of India must take some stern action so that Sri Lanka desists from adopting such methods. When his resignation was demanded in the Parliament of Sri Lanka, Sri Jayawardene said that this was only possible if one becomes unsound of mind or leunatic.

SHRI VALAMPURI JOHN: Already he has become insane.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: I think so. A leunatic or unsound mind alone would do such barbaric action as taking place in Sri Lanka. So, Government of India must impress upon Jayewardene that it was better for him to go. Or, some other action is to be taken to save the lives of the innocent Tamil people.

Coming to our relations with other countries, we want good relations with all the countries of the world including America. Of the two super powers, Soviet Union proved to be the greatest friend of all those who stand for justice, for righteousness, for liberty, freedom, and for establishment of equality in the world. Soviet Union has been constantly friend of India. We know that Soviet Union is working for establishment of peace, for disarmament, for destruction of all atomic weapons and all other-destructive things, but we fail to understand why America is not responding. Of course, we have extended a hand of friendship to America. We have no quarrel with America. But we cannot forget the nature of American imperialism, that they are arming and helping those who stand not for progress but for destruction. They armed Iran during Shah and ultimately Shah had to go. They have now found a fertile ground in Pakistan, as

their base. They are supplying sophisticated weapons to Pakistan. Pakistan is also manufacturing the bomb. In spite of that, America is arming Pakistan with sophisticated weapons because they think that after having lost Iran Pakistan was the only base that could be used against other countries, especially against Soviet Union and other socialist countries. But I would like to tell this Government and also the Prime Minister that whatever weapons are supplied to Pakistan by America will not be used either against Soviet Union or against China or against Afghanistan. These weapons can only be used against India. This has been proved. Pakistan has illegally waged three wars against India. So I would like to impress upon the Foreign Minister that Government of India must tell the American Government this thing. To one of my questions in this House, the Minister of State stated that the Foreign Minister of our country is visiting America to impress upon the American Government and American leaders that these weapons which are of destructive nature and very sophisticated should not be supplied to Pakistan because these will be used against India. I do not know whether our Foreign Minister has visited and impressed upon the American leaders accordingly. But recently Mr. Natwar Singh Minister of State for External Affairs seems to have met some of the American leaders to discuss this issue but he has failed. Nothing has come out of it. Instead America has clearly told him, "we are going to help Pakistan, Pakistan is our ally and we are going to help it". and advised Mr. Natwar Singh to ask the Soviet Union to go out of Afghanistan so that they may not have to supply these AWACS to Pakistan. So they have put a condition. As a matter of fact we were not able to convince the American authorities of the danger that lies in supplying these sophisticated arms to Pakistan.

One more point...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): Mr. Reddy, please conclude.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: I am concluding, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): I have given you enough time. Instead of ten minutes I have already given you 18 minutes. So please conclude.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: So far as declaring Indian Ocean as a zone of peace is concerned, the littoral countries want it to be declared a zone of peace. A conference was to be held. Again in 1988 it is going to be held, I think. I would like to know whether any efforts are being made to convene a conference for the purpose of declaring Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. Diego Garcia has been illegally turned into an American base. We must demand that America has no right and it must vacate this base immediately and also whatever other bases they have got in the Indian Ocean.

Lastly, we must extend full support to the people of South Africa in their struggle against the Pretoria regime and its policy of apartheid. This policy of apartheid is the most brutal, criminal and it has to be opposed by every civilised man and civilised nation. In spite of the resolutions by NAM, by the African countries and even by some of the Western countries, the Pretoria Government has not come to senses. Some of the Western countries like America and West Germany are still backing it. I think there must be a strict economic blockade of South Africa. India being one of the important members of the Non Aligned Movement and the leader of NAM must take the initiative to see that no country in the world should cooperate with the Pretoria Government and apartheid is eliminated and the people of South Africa emerge as a free nation.

Lastly, one minute more...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL): Mr. Reddy, please appreciate that other members have also to speak.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: We are constantly supporting the Arab cause and we are friendly with all Arab countries. But I fail to understand why these Arab countries are not saying even a single word against the supply of sophisticated arms to Pakistan against India and against its neighbours. We want friendly relations with Arab countries. We are pleading for the Palestinian cause. And we want friendly relations with Pakistan, China, Sri Lanka and other countries. But the real issues that are involved must be tackled effectively and without any delay. There is inaction on our part. We must give up inaction. We must be inspiring and take initiative. Thank you.

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : आदरणीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, विदेश मंत्रालय द्वारा जो प्रस्ताव किया गया है मैं उसका समर्थन करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूं । यह हमारे लिए सौभाग्य की बात है कि श्री नारायण दत्त तिवारी जी हमारे विदेश मंत्री हैं और ये एक स्वतंत्रता संग्राम सेनानी हैं । जब देश की आजादी की लड़ाई लड़ी जा रही थी उस जमाने में ही भारत की विदेश नीति महात्मा गांधी, पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू और देश की आजादी की लड़ाई लड़ने वाले स्वतंत्रता संग्राम सेनानियों ने तय कर दी थी और जिस नीति को आजादी की लड़ाई के दौर में हमारे देश के नेताओं ने तय किया था उसी नीति को पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरु ने विकसित किया, उसी नीति को श्रीमती गांधी ने आगे बढ़ाया और उसी नीति पर हमारे देश के नेता राजीव गांधी जी चल रहे हैं । राष्ट्रीय हितों को प्राथमिकता देते हुए विश्व शांति और विश्व विकास ही हमारी विदेश नीति के उद्देश्य रहे रहे हैं । पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरु जी ने कहा था :

हमारी विदेश नीति का उद्देश्य विश्व शांति बनाये रखना और मानव स्वतंत्रता का विस्तार करना है । विश्व राजनीति में भारत भले ही नया है और हमारे युग की महाशक्तियों की तुलना में इसकी सैन्य शक्ति नगण्य है, किन्तु विचार और अनुभव की दृष्टि से भारत प्राचीन है और इसने जीवन के संघर्ष में अनगिनत शताब्दियों तक यात्रा की है । अपने लम्बे इतिहास में इसने शांति का पक्ष लिया है और प्रत्येक भारतीय की प्रत्येक अर्चना का अन्त हमेशा शान्ति के आह्वान से होता है । यह इस प्राचीन और वर्तमान भारत की विशषता है कि महात्मा गांधी का उदय हुआ और उन्होंने हमें शांति पूर्ण कार्य की युक्ति सिखाई । यह युक्ति प्रभावकारी थी और हमें इसका यह फल प्राप्त हुआ कि इसने न केवल हमें स्वतंत्रता की राह दिखाई बल्कि उन लोगों के साथ मित्रता की राह भी दिखाई जिनसे कल तक हमारा विवाद था ।

यही हमारी विदेश नीति का आधार और लक्ष्य है । हम न तो वास्तविकता के प्रति उदासीन हैं न ही हमारा विचार मानव स्वतंत्रता को किसी भी ओर से होने वाली किसी चुनौती को मौन स्वीकृति देने का है । जहां स्वतंत्रता खतरे में होती है अथवा न्याय को धमकी दी जाती है अथवा जहां संघर्ष शुरु हो जाता है, हम हाथ पर हाथ रखकर नहीं बैठ सकते और न बैठेंगे । हमने अपने अनुभवहीन तरीके से जो तर्क दिया है और जिसे व्यवहार में लाने का प्रयत्न किया है वह है शांति में अटूट विश्वास और इसे सुनिश्चित करने के विचार और कार्य का अथक प्रयास ।"

हमारी आजादी की लड़ाई के दौरान में हमारा संघर्ष साम्राज्यवाद के खिलाफ था, उपनिवेशवाद के खिलाफ था । दुनिया में जो पूंजीवाद और साम्राज्यवाद हुआ उसने 2 राक्षसी संतानों को जन्म दिया, एक युद्ध और दूसरा गरीबी।, दुनिया में युद्ध का खात्मा हो, दुनिया से गरीबी दूर हो यही हमारी विदेश नीति के मुख्य लक्ष्य रहे हैं, साम्राज्यवाद का अंत हो, उपनिवेशवाद का अंत हो, दुनिया में नयी आर्थिक व्यवस्था कायम हो यह भी हमारा उद्देश

है । हमारी आजादी की लड़ाई के दौर से ही महात्मा गांधी जी ने कहा था कि हमारी आजादी केवल हिन्दुस्तान के लिए आजादी नहीं है, भारत की आजादी पूरी दुनिया की आजादी के लिए है और यह आजादी की जंग लड़ी गयी है । पूरी दुनिया का विकास प्राप्त करने के लिए हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी लड़ी गयी है ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, इससे बड़ी खुशी की बात क्या होगी कि गोर्बाचेव के नेतृत्व में रूस की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी ने अपनी कांग्रेस में प्रस्ताव किया कि रूस भी अहिंसा के सिद्धांत को स्वीकार करता है, नान-वायोलेंस के सिद्धांत को रूस ने भी स्वीकार किया है । साम्राज्यवाद का का अंत हो, दुनिया में रंगभेद की समाप्ति हो, दुनिया से गरीबी दूर हो, सारे राष्ट्र अपने पैरों पर खड़े हों यही हमारी विदेश नीति की आधारशिला रही है ।

प्रश्न उठता है क्यों ये हमारे पड़ौसी देश हमारे खिलाफ होते है । दुनिया की राजनीति में कुछ जो साम्राज्यवादी देश है जो दुनिया पर अपना नियंत्रण स्थापित करके रखना चाहते है जो दुनिया को अपने पैरों तले रखना चाहते है वे यह देखते है कि अगर हिन्दुस्तान मजबूत होगा तो हमारी दुनिया से लूट खत्म हो जायेगी, दुनिया से हमारा शोषण खत्म होगा, हमारा साम्राज्यवाद समाप्त होगा, हमारा उपनिवेशवाद खत्म होगा, हम दुनिया की लूट नहीं कर पाएंगे दुनिया में जो आर्थिक शोषण हम कर रहे है उसका अंत होगा । दुनिया में नई आर्थिक व्यवस्था पैदा होगी, इसलिए भारत को कमजोर करो । इस लिए भारत के चारों तरफ हमारे पड़ौसियों को सैन्यबल से सुसज्जित करना यही उन मुल्कों का लक्ष्य रहा है ।

हमारी विदेश नीति रही है, हम चाहते रहे है कि हमारे पड़ौसी शक्ति शाली हों, सम्पन्न हों । जितना ही हमारे पड़ौसी शक्तिशाली, खुशहाल और सम्पन्न होंगे, उतना ही वह हमसे झगड़ा नहीं करेंगे । जितना ही वह कमजोर होंगे, आर्थिक दृष्टि से, राजनीतिक दृष्टि से, उतने ही वह दूसरी शक्तियों के मोहरे बन कर हिंदुस्तान को तंग करने की कोशिश करेंगे, यह बड़ी मोटी सी बात है । आज पाकिस्तान में क्यों हमारे आतंकवादियों को ट्रेनिंग दी जा रही है, क्यों लंका में इस तरह की घटनायें घट रही है ? हमारे मित्र कह रहे थे कि लंका की समस्या को हल करें, अब लंका की अपनी जो समस्या है, ठीक है, उसके पीछे किसका हाथ है ? यह भी आपको जानना होगा । अब पाकिस्तान में आतंकवादियों को ट्रेनिंग दी जा रही है. . . :

(व्यवधान)

श्री बी० सत्यनारायण रेड्डी : जिसका भी हाथ हो, समस्या को हल करो ।

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : कैसे हल होगी ? आप ही हल कीजिए ना, क्यों नहीं हल करते है ? . . : (व्यवधान) आपको भी मौका मिला था ।

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय (उत्तर प्रदेश) : हल करने का काम आपका है ।

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : ऐसे न बोलिये । यह एक ऐसा सवाल है कि किसी समस्या का हल आप जादू की छड़ी से किसी समस्या का हल आप नहीं कर सकते है । अब हमने शांतिपूर्ण तरीके से श्रीलंका की समस्या को हल करने की कोशिश की है । आज भी हमारे विदेश मंत्री उसकी कोशिश में है और उस समस्या का हल हम ढूंढेंगे, लेकिन हम युद्ध के तरीके से नहीं, समझा-बुझा कर उनको शांति के रास्ते पर ला सकते है ।

आदरणीय रेड्डी जी, पाकिस्तान में क्या हो रहा है ? क्या पाकिस्तान खुद हमारे देश के साथ ऐसा करना चाहता है ? इसके पीछे किन शक्तियों का हाथ है, क्यों पाकिस्तान को भारी मात्रा में 400-500 बिलियन रुपये की मदद मिल रही है, क्यों उनको हथियारों से

[श्री कपनाथ राय]

कैसे किया जा रहा है, क्यों उनको एफ-16 तथा बड़ी-बड़ी युद्ध की सामग्री दी जा रही है ? इसलिए कि भारत कमजोर रहे, भारत मजबूत न बनने पाये, भारत शक्तिशाली देश न बनने पाये ।

दुनिया के जो 105 देश है, उनकी लीडरशिप भारत ने की है, आज भारत 105 नान-अलाइंड कंट्रीज, की आवाज बन कर दुनिया में साम्राज्यवाद के खिलाफ रंगभेद के खिलाफ आर्थिक शोषण के खिलाफ, युद्ध के खिलाफ एक शक्तिशाली आवाज बन गया है । यह उन राष्ट्रों को पंसद नहीं है और इसीलिए वह हिंदुस्तान को अंदर से और बाहर से तोड़ने की कोशिश करते है, इसलिए हमारे विरोधी दल के मित्रों राष्ट्रीय मतैक्य, हमारी विदेश नीति सर्व-सम्मत हमारे पूरे राष्ट्र की नीति है । इस नीति पर हमारे बीच में कोई मतभेद नहीं है । यह दुनिया के सामने हमारा इम्प्रेशन जाना चाहिए ।

आज दुनिया के सामने सवाल क्या है ? या तो एटमी हथियार मिटा देंगे, वरना इस दुनिया वालों को एटमी हथियारों को मिटाना होगा । आज पूरी दुनिया युद्ध के कगार पर खड़ी है । या तो दुनिया को एटमी हथियार मिटा देंगे, वरना दुनिया वालों को एटमी हथियार मिटाने होंगे । भारत एटमी हथियार मिटाने के लिए लगातार 1947 से आज तक कोशिश कर रहा है । दुनिया में शांति, दुनिया में निरस्त्रीकरण दुनिया में विकास और युद्ध की समाप्ति और दुनिया में अमन तथा दुनिया में आजादी की एक आवाज बन कर भारत सारी दुनिया के बीच में है । कौन इन तथ्यों से इंकार कर सकता है ?

हमारी विदेश नीति इतनी अच्छी रही है कि जो न केवल हिंदुस्तान के हितों की रक्षा करती है, बल्कि दुनिया के उन नव-स्वतंत्र, नये आजाद मुल्कों की भी मदद करती है और दुनिया में अफ्रीका के सवाल पर राजीव गांधी जी ने उठाते है, हरारे सम्मेलन में प्रधान मंत्री, श्री राजीव गांधी जी ने दक्षिण अफ्रीका के लोगों की आवाज उठाई, उसका परिणाम क्या होता है ? वह मुल्क जो चाहते है न कि कोई आवाज उठाये, जब हम आवाज उठाते है, तो तरह-तरह से हमारी आजादी का गला घोटने की कोशिश की जाती है ।

आपने अभी अरब देशों का मामला उठाया । जब फिलिस्तीन की आजादी का गला घोटा जा रहा था, तो फिलिस्तीनियों के समर्थन में आवाज केवल इन्दिरा गांधी ने उठाई, किसी अरब देश ने नहीं उठाई । हम आजादी के समर्थक है । क्या किसी अरब देश ने फिलिस्तीन के समर्थन में कोई आवाज उठाई ? क्योंकि वह साम्राज्यवादी पैरों के तले दबे हुए है, उनमें हिम्मत नहीं है और दम नहीं है । 72 घंटे बम्बार्डमेंट होता रहा, हजारों-हजार फिलिस्तीनियों की गर्दनें काट दी गई, मगर अराफात के समर्थन में और फिलिस्तीनी आजादी के समर्थन में आवाज हिंदुस्तान ने उठाई।

निकारागुआ के लोगों के पक्ष में हमारे देश ने आवाज उठाई । क्या बर्दाश्त कर सकते है साम्राज्यवादी देश कि हिन्दुस्तान, यह हमारा देश अमरीका में भी दखल दें अमरीका में हो रहे जुल्मों के खिलाफ बोले । इसी इंदिरा गांधी यह कहती है कि रेगन तुम फिलिस्तीन की आजादी करो वही इंदिरा गांधी कहती है कि अफगानिस्तान से रूसी फौजें वापस हो जानी चाहिए । यह दर असल हिन्दुस्तान की विदेश नीति में है । आदरणीय उपसभापति महोदय, मैं चाहता हूं कि विदेश नीति के सवाल पर जैसे राष्ट्रीय मौका रहा है, वैसे रहना चाहिए और हमारे मित्रों को इसका समर्थन करना चाहिए । आदरणीय उप सभाध्यक्ष महोदय, श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी ने यह कहा था यह आवश्यक है कि हम गुट निरपेक्षता के प्रति अपनी वचनबद्धता की फिर से पुष्टि करें और प्रत्येक मामले पर स्वतंत्र रूप से अपना निर्णय लेने पर जोर दें जिस पर किसी भी दबाव का कोई प्रभाव नहीं पड़े । हमारी भौगोलिक राजनीतिक [illegible]

लेकर हमारे किन्हीं मलभूत सिद्धातों के प्रति वचनबद्धता की है और उससे भी बढ़कर हमारे राष्ट्रीय हित हमारी विदेश निति के निर्णायक काम होंगे। हमारे देश के नेता राजीव गांधी ने भारत के प्रधान मंत्री का पद सम्भालते ही जो देश के नाम घोषणा की वह हमारी राष्ट्रीय कसौटी पर खरी उतरी तथा उसके अनुरूप विदेश नीति विरासत में मिली है जिससे हमारे राष्ट्रीय हित को बढ़ावा मिलता है। हमारा सदा शांति के लिए कार्य करने में विश्वास रहा है पारस्परिक लाभ और न्याय के आधार पर सभी देशों से मित्रता परस्पर सहयोग, न्याय और समानता पर आधारित एक नई विश्व अर्थ व्यवस्था और निर्गटता वचनबद्धता हमारी नीति का मूल आधार है। इस का तात्पर्य है कि हमारी विदेश नीति विकास के दोहरे उद्देश्यों के प्रति पूर्णतः सफल रही है यह शांति और विकास के प्रति हमारी विदेश नीति की वचनबद्धता है। वर्ल्ड परस्पैक्टिव, ग्लोबल परस्पक्टव में हिन्दुस्तान की क्या भूमिका होगी, हिन्दुस्तान अपनी चाल खुद चलेगा या दूसरो की चाल के साथ चलेगा. यह बुनियादी प्रश्न है। हिन्दुस्तान की विदेश नीति का आधार हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी का इतहास रहा है। हिन्दुस्तान उस आजादी की लड़ाई को मद्देनजर रखते हुए अपनी चाल खुद निर्धारित करता है। दुनिया दो गुटों में बंटी हुई है। उन गुटो से अलग पहले 4–5 देश गुट निरपेक्ष थे। और आज 105 देश गुटनिरपेक्ष आंदोलन में शामिल हो चुके हैं। विश्व की सब से बड़ी शक्ति वर्ल्ड ओपीनियन आज हमारे पक्ष में हैं। हम दुनिया में एक नया इंटरनेशनल इकोनॉमिक आर्डर लाना चाहते है। विकासशील देश और विकसित देश के बीच इंटरेक्शन चाहते हैं। विकसित देश अपनी टैक्नोलोजी को ट्रांसफर करें ताकि विकासशील देश भी अपने पैरों पर खड़े हों। एक नई अर्थ व्यवस्था दुनिया में हो विकास की अर्थ व्यवस्था हो। दुनिया से गरीबी मिटे और जल्दी मिटे। इस दुनिया में जब युद्ध का अंत होगा तब गरीबी मिटेगी। इसी–लिए हमारे देश के नेताओं ने ऐसी विदेश नीति का समर्थन किया है जिसमें युद्ध का अंत हो और गरीबी की समाप्ति हो, जिसमें कि विश्वशांति हो, जिसमें नया इकोनिमिक आर्डर हो। दुनिया ऐसे चौराहे पर खड़ी है, आज दुनिया ऐसी जगह पहुंच गई है कि या तो दुनिया में एटॉमिक हथियार इस दुनिया को मिटायेंगे वरना एटॉमिक हथियारों को दुनिया को मिटाना होगा। आदरणीय उप सभाध्यक्ष महोदय, हम अपने पड़ोसियों से अपने रिश्ते हमेशा अच्छे रखना चाहते हैं। इसीलिए सार्क की स्थापना में भारत सात देशों का नेता है। हम चाहते हैं हमारे संबंध श्रीलंका से अच्छे हो, नेपाल से अच्छे, हो, बर्मा से अच्छे हो, बंगलादेश से अच्छे हो, पाकिस्तान से अच्छे हो। ये हमारे पड़ोसी राष्ट्र हैं। इन पड़ोसियों से हमारे रिश्ते जितने ही मजबूत होंगे उतनी ही दूनिया में हमारी आवाज मजबत होगी। साम्राज्यवादी देश यही चीज नहीं चाहते । व चाहते हैं हिन्दुस्तान को पाकिस्तान से लड़ा दो, हिन्दुस्तान को लंका से लड़ा दो, हिन्दुस्तान को बंगला देश से लड़ा दो, हिन्दुस्तान को एशिया के ही झगड़े में फंसा रहने दो, हिन्दुस्तान को चीन से फंसा तो ताकि हिन्दुस्तान की आवाज दुनिया के पैमाने की आवाज न बन सके। हमारी विदेश नीति सब से अच्छी रही है। इस नीति पर चल कर ही हम दुनिया में शांति और विकास चाहते हैं। यह रास्ता हमारी आजादी की लड़ाई का रास्ता है। उस रास्ते को जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने आगे बढ़ाया। उस रास्ते को श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी ने बहुत मजबूत किया और उसी रास्ते पर राजीव गांधी चल कर दुनिया में नई आर्थिक व्यवस्था, विश्व शांति विश्व विकास के सपने को साकार करना चाहते हैं ताकि एक नई दुनिया, शक्तिशाली, दुनिया, गरीबी से मुक्त दुनिया जिसमें युद्ध न हो, जिसमें शांति हो, ऐसी दुनिया का निर्माण हो सके। यही हमारी भारत की विदेश नीति का समर्थन करते हुए हम नए विदेश मंत्री से यह आशा करते हैं कि हम आजादी की लड़ाई के सेनानी शांतिदूत बनकर रेगन और गोर्बाचेव के बीच जितने तनाव को दूर कर सकेंगे उतनी ही यह हमारे देश के लिए बड़ी बात होगी।

[श्री कल्पनाथ राय]

4.00 P.M.

यह हमारे देश का उद्देश्य रहा है –

यदा यदा हि धर्मस्य ग्लानिर्भवति भारत:
अभ्युत्थानमधर्मस्य तदात्मानम् सृजाम्यहम ।

परित्राणाय साधुनाम विनाशयच दुस्कृताम,
धर्म संस्थापनार्थाय : संभावामि युग–युगे ।

धर्म दीर्घकालीन राजनीति है, राजनीति अल्पकालीन धर्म है। हमें विश्वास है कि आदरणीय श्री नारायण दत्त तिवारी के विदेश मंत्रित्व काल में हमारी विदेश नीति और विकसित होगी, हम दुनिया में शांति और विकास की आवाज को और मजबूत बनाएंगे ताकि युद्ध न हो, दुनिया में एटामिक हथियारों का निरस्त्रीकरण हो, दुनिया में जो अरबों, खरबों रुपया हथियारों पर खर्च हो रहा है, वह पैसा गरीबी दूर करने पर खर्च हो। यही हमारी विदेश नीति का मूल तंत्र है । हमें विश्वास है कि हम इस विदेश नीति को राजीव गांधी जी के नेतृत्व में आगे पड़ कर दुनिया में विश्व विकास और विश्व शांति जो हमारा आजादी की लड़ाई का उद्देश्य रहा है, उसको अवश्य हासिल करेंगे । इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ में विदेश मंत्रालय की मांगो का समर्थन करता हुं । धन्यवाद ।

श्री प्रमोद महाजन, (महाराष्ट्र) : उपसभाध्यक्ष जी क्षण भर के लिए मैं माननीय कल्पनाथ रायजी की इस बात से सहमत होने का प्रयास कर रहा था कि हमारा सौभाग्य है कि श्री नारायण दत्त तिवारी हमारे विदेश मंत्री है, लेकिन केवल डर यह लगता है कि सवा दो वर्षों में चार विदेश मंत्री पांच विदेश राज्यमंत्री और चार विदेश सचिव बदलने वाली इस सरकार में पता नहीं यह सौभाग्य कितने दिनों तक हमारे साथ रहेगा । इतनी बदलती देश की स्थिति में यह बदलता मंत्रालय हिन्तुस्तान की विदेश नीति को एक ठोस आधार पर खड़ा करने के प्रयास में पूरी तरह असफल है । विदेशी–नीति की सफलता नेताओं के स्वागत में बिछाये गये लाल दरियों की नरमाइयों में या लंबाइयों में गिनी नहीं जाती, मोमबतीयुक्त रात्रि–भोजन में परोसे गये व्यंजनों में तोली नहीं जाती और न नेताओं के भाषणों के बाद औपचारिक रूप से बजायी गयी तालियों की गड़गड़ाहट में नापी जाती है । विदेशी नीति की सफलता का एक सबसे प्रमुख मानदंड हैं हमारे रक्षा मंत्रालय का बजट । विदेश नीति और रक्षा नीति एक ही सिक्के के दो पहलू है । इन्हें एक दूसरे से अलग किया नहीं जा सकता। विदेशी नीति की सफलता या असफलता की कीमत हम रक्षा मंत्रालय के घटते या बढ़ते बजट के रुप में चुकाते रहते है । मेरे कहने का कतई यह उद्देश्य नहीं है कि रक्षा मंत्रालय का वर्तमान बजट कम हो । हां, हो सकता है तो कमीशन बन्द हो । लेकिन बजट- कम करने की अवश्यकता नहीं है । देश की सुरक्षा सर्वोपरि है । इस विषय में हम महाभारत के "वयम् पंचाधिक शतम" इस सिद्धांत से वचनबद्ध है । लेकिन हम यह भूल नहीं कर सकते, दिन दुगुना रात चौगुना बढ़ने वाला रक्षा मंत्रालय का यह बजट हमारे देश की रक्षा पर मंडराने वाले खतरों की ओर संकेत देता है । किसी भी राष्ट्र की विदेश–नीति का मूल उद्देश्य देश की सुरक्षा व्यवस्था को मजबूत करना है और इसलिए सभी सीमाओं पर बैठे मित्रों का अमैत्री-पूर्ण व्यवहार और उसके कारण खतरों में फंसा देश जब रक्षा मंत्रालय का बजट बढ़ाता जाता है तो विदेशी–नीति की असफलताओं को स्वयं स्वीकार करता है ।

महोदय, देश की सुरक्षा की खतरे की घण्टी का प्रारंभ होता है पाकिस्तान से । पाकिस्तान के साथ मैत्री का हमने सदैव प्रयास किया और भी करें, इसमें हमें कोई आपत्ति नहीं है । युद्ध जीतने का सबसे बढ़िया तरीका युद्ध को रोकना है, लेकिन हम यह न भूलें कि पाकिस्तान का जन्म भारत के द्वेष के आधार पर हुआ है । क्रिकेट में शारजाह का मैदान हो

या कूटनीति की शतरंज का खेल हो, भारत को परास्त करना पाकिस्तान की विदेश–नीति का एकमात्र सूत्र है । पाकिस्तान का ऐटम बम बनाना, पंजाब में आतंकवादियों की खुले आम मदद करना, आवश्यकता से अधिक शस्त्रों का भंडार इकट्ठा करना ये सारी बातें हमें खतरे का संकेत देती है । यह यदि इस खतरे के विरूद्ध हमें खड़ा रहना है तो हमें भी एक क्षण का विलंब न करते हुए अपने ऐटम बम का निर्माण करना चाहिए आर जो सत्तारुढ़ दल के मित्र अपने भाषणों में छह राष्ट्रों के निरस्त्रीकरण की उपलब्धियां गिना रहे हैं, उन्हें मैं केवल यह सूचित करना चाहता हूं कि कल कहीं भारत को अपना ऐटम बम बनाने की नौबत आ जाए तो छह राष्ट्रों के निरस्त्रीकरण की बात हवा में रह जाएगी । यह निरस्त्रीकरण वाला खेल राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा के दांव पर खेला नहीं जा सकता, इतना इस संबंध में जरूर ध्यान रखें । पाकिस्तान के साथ विदेश नीति के बरताव में पाकिस्तान में बचे खुचे, इने गिने हिन्दुओं पर होने वाले अत्याचारों, हिन्दुओं के मंदिरों को ध्वस्त करना आदि के खिलाफ दुर्भाग्य से जितनी आवाज भारत सरकार की उठनी चाहिए, उतनी उठती नहीं है।

इसी के साथ अमरीका की विदेश नीति का उल्लेख करना भी अनुचित नहीं होगा । भारत और अमरीका दुनियां के सबसे बड़े दो जनतांत्रिक देश है । इनमें मित्रता स्वाभाविक होनी चाहिए, लेकिन यह हमारा दुर्भाग्य है कि अमरीका की विदेश नीति अधिकतम समय भारत के विरोध में रही है । यह विडंबना है कि अपने देश में जनतांत्रिक परंपराओं की अत्यधिक आदर करने वाली अमरीकी सरकार की विदेश नीति सदैव तानाशाहों का समर्थन करती आई है । अमरीका की इस नीति की जितनी निन्दा की जाए कम है । लेकिन मैं इसके साथ केवल इतना स्पष्ट करना चाहता हूं कि सरकारी तौर पर भले ही अमरीका की नीति भारत के खिलाफ हो, जनता के तौर पर भारत और अमरीका में जिस प्रकार के पारस्परिक संबंध है, उनका आना जाना या बसना, शायद ही और किसी अन्य देश के साथ ऐसे संबंध होंगे । इसलिए अमरीकी की भारत विरोधी नीति की कड़ी आलोचना और तीव्र निन्दा करते हुए भी हमें अमरीका के जनमत को उसकी सरकार की गलत नीतियों के खिलाफ़ जागृत करने का प्रयास करना होगा और उसमें विजय अमृतराज से लेकर जो-जो भी भारत तथा अमरीका के मित्र है, उनका उपयोग करके हमें अमरीका की सरकार की नीति के विरुद्ध जनमत तैयार करना चाहिए । अमरीका जनतांत्रिक देश होने के कारण इसकी संभावना है कि हम अमरीकी सरकार की भारत विरोधी नीति को अपनी ताकत के बल पर तथा जनमत के बल पर अपने पक्ष में कर सकते है । पश्चिमी सीमा के बाद हमारी नजर जाती है बरफीली उत्तर पूर्वी सीमा की ओर तो हम कह सकते है कि हम सभी पड़ोसी देशों से दोस्ती चाहते है, लेकिन उनके साथ हमारी सीमाओं के विवादों का समाधान चाहते है । चीन इस नीति का अपवाद हो नहीं सकता । लेकिन लगता यह है कि चीन के इरादे नेक नहीं है । 1962 से हमारी हजारों वर्ग किलोमीटर भूमि पर 25 वर्ष से वह कब्जा करके बैठा है । उल्टा चोर कोतवाल को डांटे की उक्ति के अनुसार चीन 90 हजार वर्ग किलोमीटर भूमि हड़पने का आरोप भारत पर लगा रहा है । सीमा विवाद सुलझाने के लिए पूर्वी क्षेत्रों में वह भारत से रियायतें मांग रहा है । सारे अरुणाचल पर अपना अधिकार जता रहा है । समदोरांगचू घाटी में उसने हैलीपैड बनाया है, मकान खड़े कर रहा है और ये भी खबरें हैं कि वह लगान वसूल कर रहा है । समाचार-पत्रों में छपी खबरों में इस गर्मी में चीन युद्ध की ओर संकेत किया गया है । आखिर हमारी इस धवल सीमा पर क्या हो रहा है, इसके बारे में सरकार अंधरे में है । चर्चा का सातवां दौर समाप्त कर हम आठवें दौर में पहुंच रहे है, लेकिन अभी भी चीन के संबंध में स्पष्ट रूप से भारत की नीति के संबंध में जनता को जानकारी नहीं है । इसके साथ ही मैं एक बात चीन के सम्बन्ध में कहना चाहूंगा । इनके सात दौरों की चर्चा हो या कोई

[श्री प्रमोद महाजन]

और चर्चा हो या सीमा विवाद को सुलझाना हो इसमें विदेश मंत्री जी से दो टूक आश्वासन चाहूंगा कि भारत की एक इंच भूमि भी किसी हालत में, किसी भी मोह से चीन को दान नहीं की जायेगी? 1962 में जो भारत की संसद ने एक मुख से अपनी भूमि लौटा लेने का जो संकल्प लिया है उस संकल्प के साथ हम बेईमानी नहीं करेंगे और हम अपनी भूमि का एक इंच भी दानपात्र में दान नहीं देंगे इस प्रकार का स्पष्ट आश्वासन मैं मंत्री महोदय से चाहता हूं। क्योंकि युद्ध में तो शायद यह ठीक काम करते है लेकिन समझौतों में हम गड़गबड़ कर जाते है। इस पुराने इतिहास को देख कर में यह दो टुक आश्वासन चाहूंगा।

पाकिस्तान–चीन–अमेरिका का त्रिकोण कुविख्यात है ही लेकिन इसी के साथ रूस की विदेश नीति की चर्चा करना भी गलत नहीं होगा। रूस हमारा एक विश्वसनीय मित्र है। रूस की और भारत की मैत्री परीक्षा की अग्नि से तप कर विशुद्ध रूप से निकली है। कश्मीर–गोवा–बांगला देश की संकट की घड़ियों में रूस ने हमारा साथ दिया है लेकिन हम यह भूल नहीं सकते कि विदेश नीति में न कोई शाश्वत मित्र होता, न कोई शाश्वत शत्रु, शाश्वत होता है राष्ट्र का स्वार्थ। अपने राष्ट्र के हित के लिए रूस चीन के साथ सम्बन्धों में सुधार लाने की लगातार कोशिश कर रहा है अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय समाचार पत्रों में खबरों का शीर्षक है यू०एस०एस०आर० फ्लर्टिंग विद् चाइना। उनकी घोषित नीति चीन की दोस्ती के साथ है और इसका असर भारत की विदेश नीति पर जरूर पड़ेगा। गोर्बाचोव हमारे यहां आय। हमने स्वागत किया। रूस की मैत्री का हम आदर करते है लेकिन जब चीन के हमले के सम्बन्ध में पूछा गया तो गोर्बाचीव ने जो उत्तर दिया वह हिन्दुस्तान की चिन्ता का समाधान नहीं कर सकता। मुझे कभी–कभी डर लगता है कि शायद इतिहास कहीं दोहरा न जाये। 25 वर्ष पूर्व रूस ने यह कहा था कि चीन हमारा भाई है भारत हमारा दोस्त है। चीन के साथ हमारा खून का रिश्ता है और भारत के साथ पानी और होड का रिश्ता है लेकिन खून का रिश्ता नहीं है इसलिए भारत की सारी विदेश नीति में जो जरूरत से ज्यादा रूस की सहायता के साथ चलने का है मैं विदेश मंत्री जी से इस विषय में भी प्रार्थना करूंगा कि इस बैसाखी का सहयोग हर विषय पर, हर मुद्दे पर हमारा साथ दे नहीं सकता यह समझ कर हम अपनी नीति बनायें।

उत्तर के हिमालय से दक्षिण की ओर देखें तो अशांत हिन्द महासागर में जलती श्रीलंका नजर आती है। किसी भी देश के घरेलू मामलों पर दखलदाजी करना हम उचित नहीं समझते लेकिन श्रीलंका में जिन पर नरसंहार हो रहा है वह भारतीय मूल के हैं, हमारे तमिल भाषी भाई हैं, हम उसे सह नहीं सकते। लेकिन दुर्भाग्य से गत दो वर्षों में पांच हनुमान भेजे लेकिन श्रीलंका के रुख में कोई अन्तर नहीं आया। नेपाल और बंगलादेश के साथ भी रिश्तों में रूखापन आया है। नेपाल की प्रभुत्वसंपन्नता का हम आदर करते हैं लेकिन जाने अनजाने में नेपाल के द्वारा कोई ऐसी बात न हो जिससे हमारी सुरक्षा पर आंच आये। हमारी सीमा पर पुलों का निर्माण, रास्ते, बिजलीघर, सीमेंट के कारखाने आदि में चीनियों का काम करना हमारे लिये खतरे की लाल निशानी है। बांगला देश के जन्म में हमारी सहायता सर्वज्ञात है, लेकिन कुछ ही वर्षों में बांगला देश का रूख बदल गया और खासकर बंगला देश में बसे लाखों हिन्दुओं पर जिस प्रकार के अत्याचार होते हैं उस पर हमारी सरकार की चुप्पी या खामोशी आश्चर्यजनक तथा निन्दनीय है। अन्त में, उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, इतना ही कहूंगा कि किसी भी देश की विदेश नीति का एक उद्देश्य होता है कि अपने देश की सुरक्षा हो। किसी भी छोटे-मोटे देश की विदेश नीति का उद्देश्य यह हो सकता है। कभी कभी मुझे लगता है कि भारत सरकार को कोई गलतफहमी है कि निर्गुटता ही हमारी विदेश नीति का उद्देश्य है। निर्गुटता हमारा साधन है, साध्य नहीं है। 105 राष्ट्रों का नेतृत्व हमारा भ्रम है, वास्तविकता नहीं है। जिस किसी देश में निर्गुट सम्मेलन होता है उस देश के प्रमुख को उसका अध्यक्ष बनाया जाता है। इतनी मामूली चीज को भी

हम नेतृत्व मान बैठें तो हमारे लिये आगे समस्याओं का निर्माण होगा ही । मैं केवल इतना ही कहना चाहता हूं कि अमेरिका का उद्देश्य है रूस की घेराबन्दी करो, साम्यवाद पर रोक लगाओ और अपने प्रभुत्व का निर्माण करो । रूस का उद्देश्य है विश्व में साम्यवाद का प्रसार करो और घेराबन्दी तोड़ो, अपने प्रभुत्व का विश्व निर्माण करो । यहां तक कि चीन जो हमारे साथ ही आजाद हुआ था, उसका उद्देश्य इस सदी के अन्त तक एक तीसरी महाशक्ति के रूप में विश्व में उभर कर आना है । मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि भारत की विदेश नीति का उद्देश्य क्या है ? शांति और सद्भावना के लिये, बन्धुत्व के लिये स्वतंत्रता को ताकत देनी पड़ती है । राष्ट्रकवि दिनकर ने कहा था--

> क्षमा शोभती उस भुजंग को,
> जिसके पास गरल हो,
> उसका क्या जो दंतहीन,
> विषरहित, विनीत,
> सरल हो ।

जिसके पास दांत नहीं, है, विष नहीं है, वह क्षमा नहीं कर सकता, वह शांति नहीं ला सकता है । इसलिये भारत जिसकी इतनी प्राचीन परम्परा है, जिसका उल्लेख अभी माननीय सदस्य ने भी किया है, इतनी प्राचीन परम्परा वाला देश जिसकी 70 करोड़ की आबादी है, जो विभिन्न ताकतों का देश है, जो दुनिया में तीसरी क्रमिक वैज्ञानिक शक्ति वाला देश है, जिसको इतना बड़ा समुद्र का किनारा प्राप्त है, ऐसा देश जो महासागरों की प्रवेश द्वार पर बैठा है, ऐसा देश इतनी सारी बातों के होने के बाद क्या भारत अपने आप में इस सदी के अन्त तक इस दुनिया में ऐसी महाशक्ति के रूप में उभरेगा जो महाशक्ति इन तीनों महाशक्तियों से अलग होगी, शांति के लिये होगी, बन्धुत्व के लिये होगी, सद्भाव के लिये होगी ? अगर हम यह राष्ट्रीय उद्देश्य बनाकर अपनी विदेश नीति को चलाने की कोशिश करेंगे तो मुझे लगता है कि हमारी विदेश नीति का राष्ट्रीय उद्देश्य पूरा होगा । अन्यथा हम छोटे-छोटे झमेलों में फंस जायेंगे । मैं चाहता हू कि सरकार अपनी ओर से भारत इस सदी के अन्त तक इस प्रकार की महाशक्ति के रूप में उभरेगा, इस नीति पर अपना वक्तव्य दे ।

SHRI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the Annual Report of the Ministry of External Affairs has spelt out the various initiative taken by the Government during the last one year in the conduct of our foreign policy . I think the Government deserves to be congratulated. But perhaps given the unique nature of our freedom struggle under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi, it is only natural that independent India would pursue a foreign policy designed to promote freedom, designed to promote co-operation and designed to promote peace, while safeguarding the security environment in a fast-changing global situation. I think we can feel proud of the historic role played by our country in rendering assistance to the struggle against colonialism and imperialism. We feel proud of the fact that our country is taking an active interest in the struggle against colonialism and the racist regime in Southern Africa. The initiative to set up the AFRICA Fund and to aid the Frontline States in their fight against racial oppression and destabilization has won the admiration of the people all over the world for the efforts taken by India. Perhaps we can make an even more serious effort to contact voluntary organizations and anti-apartheid groups all over the world so that the struggle against racial oppression and colonialism could be undertaken in future with greater vigour. For us as Indias, the struggle against apartheid is a commitment which is a reaffirmation of our faith in those ideals that led Mahatma Gandhi to fire the first salvo in the battle against racial oppression in South Africa all those years ago.

Sir, the Prime Minister deserves to be congratulated on his commitment to disarmament and world peace. The six-nation initiative that was conceptualised by Mrs. Indira Gandhi has given a boost to the hopes of those who realise the horrible devastation and annihilation that

[Shri Jayanthi Natarajan]

will be brought about by nuclear warfare. More thought needs to be given on how we could all work together in building up a universal consensus for calling for the destruction of nuclear arsenals and elimination of nuclear weapons from the face of the earth.

Coming closer to home, we are unfortunately faced with situation of deteriorating security consequent upon the induction of sophisticated arms into Pakistan. Members from all sides of the House have vioced concern over the supply of AWACS aircraft to Pakistan. It is a tragedy that a neighbouring country like Pakistan is being drawn as a pawn into the strategy of super-powers in its selfish quest for arms and money. What is even more alarming is that there is a clear evidence that Pakistan has not only acquired nuclear arms capability but is well on its way to creating a nuclear weapons stockpile. And what is more, the U.S.A. has clearly indicated that it is not merely a passive spectator but will also turn a blind eye towards its proteges in quest of nuclear arms capability. While the Pakistanis may be deriving a momentary propaganda advantage over the fact that India might have to endorse the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty through the backdoor, I think, Sir, that it needs to be made very, very clear that India should now concentrate on the fact that Pakistan is a covert nuclear power, and our policy towards Pakistan has to take this into consideration as a very serious aspect. The Government of India has made a very large number of efforts to improve and normalise relations with the people of Pakistan with whom we have no quarrel. A great deal of initiative has been taken by our Government to improve and facilitate travel, to improve people-to-people contact, by importing and sending out newspapers, periodicals, by promoting cultural exchange. But though the Pakistan Government pays lip service to the theory of normalisation, in practice the Government has not responded positively at all. What is particularly disturbing in Pakistan is the recent media coverage in Pakistan about events in India. What is mistakenly being assumed by the Government of Pakistan is India's preoccupation with domestic issues that has led and possibly encouraged the Pakistan Government to be a little more adventuristic in its attitude towards India. They feel perhaps that due to our preoccupation with domestic issues we will not be able to maintain security, unity and integrity of our country. This notion has to be dispelled. It is disturbing that the recent intemperate statements by President Zia equating the issue of Afghanistan with Kashmir and also statements by their Foreign Minister, Mr. Noorani, about Indian Muslims have all been brought about by this mistaken notion that India is now too preoccupied to be concerned about its security interests. Pakistan should not be left in any doubt about our ability to safeguard the security environment of our country, notwithstanding the great confidence that they are receiving from their super power ally.

I think the Prime Minister needs to be also commended for the patience and perseverence with which the Government of India is tackling the difficult and ticklish question of Sri Lanka. Sir, over the last five days we have witnessed a terrible deterioration in the trends in Sri Lanka. While in the past President Jayewardene has not responded positively and has adopted an extremely ambivalent posture in response to the December 19th proposals that were sent by our Government and then unilaterally announced a cease-fire which was probably not so much from a humanistic or a human point of view but was more probably to serve a kind of enlightened self-interest.

In view of the fact that the beleaguered troops were pressing for their annual holiday and in view of the fact that the Srilankan and Tamil, New Year's Day fell on April 14. However, it is difficult to imagine that the ceasefire was out of a genuine desire for peace, particularly because the militants never accepted it in the first place. It was probably also a pseudo-positive gesture aimed at the Aid Sri Lanka Consortium which is to meet in

June or July. They wanted to give some positive signs from their side that the Sri Lanka Government was taking steps to stop the genocide. Whatever it was, I submit that the unilateral ceasefire declared by Mr. Jayewardene was an eyewash. No ceasefire can be effective unless it is bilateral, based upon mutually-agreed terms and binding upon both the parties. The brave militants who are fighting the battle of the beleaguered Tamils of Sri Lanka had clearly stated that they would not be willing to enter upon a ceasefire so long as the Government did not lift its economic and military blockade, so long as the bombing of innocent civilians did not stop and so long as the Government did not resume its January 26 position which was what is known as the pre-offensive position. In this view of the matter, the unilateral ceasefire was a farce and, therefore, it required very little provocation for the ceasefire to be cancelled. The bomb blast in Colombo in which 150 civilians were killed provided the Sri Lankan Government with an excuse to begin once again its bombardment of the peninsula Jaffna. But, to my mind, what was the most shocking event of all was the statement of the Prime Minister of Sri Lanka, Mr. Premadasa, saying that whoever sought for a political solution in Sri Lanka would be Sri Lanka's greatest enemy. Rightly, Sir, our Government has condemned the stand taken by the Sri Lanka Prime Minister. But perhaps, in my opinion, our condemnation could have been in stronger terms. We could have made it even more clear that in this view of the matter, if this is the attitude of the Sri Lankan Government, if this was the negtive attitude as opposed to the ambivalent attitude that the Government had taken all this time, then India would no longer try to find a solution, a peaceful solution, to the problem. But perhaps again it was as a result of the condemnation and the displeasure conveyed by India that President Jayewardene has today come out with another statement that his Governmen was pro-peace and pro-political solution. Perhaps, once again President Jayewardene is being extremely simplistic in his view of the matter because he simply dismisses the problem of the militants as terrorism. This is, as we all know, not the issue. What the militants are fighting for is an emotional cause, a just cause, and it is for us to do all that we can purely in human interest in a country that is so close to us to prevent the terrible genocide that is going on.

One more suggestion, Sir. While we have to see that the genocide is stopped, while we have to have a moral and human attitude, it is my submission that, at the same time, we have to maintain friendly relations with Sri Lanka because it is very important that the Indian Ocean is maintained as a zone of peace. We should not advocate any open break with Sri Lanka because that will give a super power a foothold in that island which will endanger the concept of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

With regard to China, it is very surprising that China should object to the fact that Arunachal Pradesh has been given statehood. But, in my opinion, although the official level dialogue is going on between China and India to resolve the border issue, it is very important that we now raise the level of the talks to the political level so that a quicker solution can be found and a firmness is given to our policy with regard to China.

The nation today is posed with many challenges. The policy of non-alignment which was conceptualised by Nehru Ji and given a concrete shape by Shrimati Indira Gandhi, has been imparted a new sense of dynamism by our young Prime Minister. We have no doubt that a strong and self-reliant India capable of resisting the pressures of all the big powers will be construed as a threat by nations all over the World. But I am equally clear that we will never fall a prey to these pressures. Our Government and the people will unitedly resist any effort to destabilise us and to deter us from the pursuit of independent foreign policy.

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय : माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, हमारे भारत की जो विदेश नीति है उसके पीछे जो मूलभूत आधार सिद्धांत हैं वे हैं, अहिंसा, विश्व शांति, गुट निरपेक्षता, निरस्त्रीकरण, मानव अधिकारों की रक्षा और जीओ और जीने दो, साथ

[श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय]

ही साथ सह अस्तित्व का सिद्धांत । तो हमारी जो विदेश नीति है यह बहुत ही अच्छी है और राष्ट्रीय हित में है ? लेकिन इन नीतियों का कार्यान्वयन जिन लोगों के हाथ में रहा है, शुरू से लकर आज तक, चाहे वे श्री जवाहर लाल नेहरू रहे हों, चाहे श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी रही हों या श्री राजीव गांधी रहे हों, इनकी असफलता की चर्चा विदेश मंत्रालय की एनुअल रिपोर्ट में है यह जो 86–87 की है । आखिर क्या कारण है कि हमारे जितने भी पड़ौसी मुल्क हैं चाहे वह पाकिस्तान हो, चाहे वह चीन हो चाहे वह श्रीलंका हो या कोई जैसे बंगलादेश है, उनसे हमारे रिश्ते मित्र के नहीं हैं या उनसे हमारे रिश्ते दोस्ती के नहीं हैं । 1962 में चीन ने हमारे देश के साथ गद्दारी की, हमारी जमीन पर कब्जा कर लिया और संसद में 1962 में प्रस्ताव भी पारित किया गया सर्वसम्मति से, एकमत से कि अपनी भूमि का एक एक इंच हम वापस लेंगे लेकिन आज तक उस भूमि को वापस लेने में भारत सरकार पूर्ण रूप से असफल रही है और इस एनुअल रिपोर्ट में भी इस बात की चर्चा की गयी है कि पिछले अगस्त महीने में अरूणाचल प्रदेश के तवांग जिले की समदूरांग चू घाटी के 120 वर्ग किलोमीटर क्षेत्र पर चीन ने अपना कब्जा कर लिया है । अभी प्रमोद महाजन ने इस बात की चर्चा की कि वहां पर कर की वसूली की जा रही है । वहां पर चीन के जो फौजी लोग हैं उनके रहने के लिये झोपड़ियां बनाई जा रही हैं और साथ ही साथ हमारी जो सीमा है इस पर तनाव उत्पन्न हो रहा है । इस एनुअल रिपोर्ट में भी इस बात की चर्चा की गयी है कि :

"The efforts of the Government of India to improve relations with the people's Republic of China and secure a fair and satisfactory settlement of the boundary issue were adversely affected by the Chinese intrusion into the Sumdorong Chu Valley area of the Tawang district of Arunachal Pradesh."

मैं विदेश मंत्री जी से पूछना चाहता हूं कि अगस्त के महीने में तवांग जनपद में चाइनीज ने जो घुसपैठ की थी उस भूमि को आज तक हम लोग वापस ले पाये कि नहीं और वापस लेने के सिलसिले में हमारी ओर से क्या कार्यवाही की जा रही है । इसी संसद में पिछले दिसम्बर के महीने में जब अरूणाचल प्रदेश को पूरे राज्य का दर्जा दिया गया तो चीन सरकार ने एक वक्तव्य दिया और

[उप-सभापति महोदया पीठासीन हुईं]

इस बात पर नाराजी जाहिर की कि भारत की संसद को इस बात का अधिकार नहीं है कि भारत अपने ही प्रदेश, अपने ही सूबे, अपने ही राज्य के सिलसिले में उसको पूर्ण राज्य का दर्जा देने के लिये संसद में कोई प्रस्ताव पारित करे । इस सिलसिले में उल्टे चोर ने ही कोतवाल को डांटा है । 12 अगस्त, 1986 को चीन की सरकार ने एक वक्तव्य प्रकाशित किया और वह वक्तव्य सरकारी वक्तव्य है और उस वक्तव्य में भारत सरकार को इस बात की धमकी दी गयी है कि इसके नतीजे बहुत ही खतरनाक होंगे और इसलिये मैं इस सभा के समक्ष उनके वक्तव्य को आपकी अनुमति से पढ़ना चाहूंगा । 12 अगस्त, 1986 का चीन का वक्तव्य है :

"The above-mentioned Bill approved by the Indian Parliament is basically illegal, and that Chinese will never recognise the so-called Arunachal Pradesh, established in the most disputed sector of China-India border. McMahon Line of 1915 is illegal and that has never been recognised by the Chinese Government. The so-called Arunachal Pradesh is basically an Indian occupied area of the Chinese territory lying between the traditional customary lines and the illegal McMahon Line. It is entirely futile for the Indian authorities to try to legalise the occupation of Chinese territory through domestic legislation and the consequence arising therefrom will be very serious."

यह चीन सरकार का अधिकृत वक्तव्य है और इसलिये मैं विदेश मंत्री जी से चीन सरकार के इस वक्तव्य के सिलसिले में भारत सरकार की क्या प्रतिक्रिया है यह

जानना चाहूंगा और मुझे पूरी आशा है कि मंत्री जी जब जवाब देंगे तो इस बात का जवाब देंगे कि अगस्त 1986 में जो हमारी सीमा पर चीन ने कब्जा कर लिया जहां पर हैलिपैड बनाया गया, उसके सिलसिले में भारत सरकार ने वापिस लेने के लिये क्या कार्यवाही की है ?

दूसरा, मैं ध्यान आकर्षिक करना चाहता हूं कि श्रीलंका में जो मानव अधिकारों का हनन हो रहा है, श्रीलंका में जो नर-संहार हो रहा है, उसकी चर्चा इस सदन में और लोक सभा में बराबर हो चुकी है।

17 जनवरी, 1985 को महामहिम राष्ट्रपति जी ने संसद के संयुक्त अधिवेशन में अपना अभिभाषण दिया था और उसमें उन्होंने श्रीलंका की जो जातीय समस्या है, उसके बारे में कुछ चर्चा की थी और उसमें इस सरकार ने उनके जरिये कुछ आश्वासन भी दिया था। उसकी धारा है 28।

"The ethnic violence in Sri Lanka is a matter of deep concern to us. We are convined that use of force cannot lead to a solution. A political process in which all the concerned parties are involved can alone result in just settlement. Conditions must be created in Sri Lanka to enable the return of large number of refugees who have been forced to take shelter in India."

यह राष्ट्रपति जी का अभिभाषण 17 जनवरी, 1985 को था। इस बीच में पांच बार हमारे देश के कभी मंत्री, कभी विदेश मंत्रालय के सचिव या कभी कोई अन्य मंत्री श्रीलंका गये, वहां के प्रधान मंत्री से या वहां के राष्ट्रपति जी से बातचीत भी की, लेकिन आज हालत यह है कि जो वार्षिक रिपोर्ट है, इसमें इस बात को स्वीकार किया गया है कि दिसम्बर 1986 तक जो एक लाख तीस हजार शरणार्थी श्रीलंका से इस देश में आए हैं, वह मूल भारतीय हैं और इस देश में आकर के बस गये हैं और अभी जिसकी यहां पर चर्चा भी की गई कि श्रीलंका की संसद में वहां के जो प्रधान मंत्री हैं, 26 अप्रैल को उन्होंने वक्तव्य दिया है कि अगर कोई मित्र-इशारा है उनका भारत सरकार की ओर भारत देश की ओर कि अगर कोई मित्र श्रीलंका सरकार से देश की जातीय समस्या का राजनीतिक समाधान खोजने का आग्रह करता है, तो उसे सब से बड़ा शत्रु समझा जाएगा।

भारत सरकार का और इस देश-वासियों का भी कहना है कि समस्या का समाधान मिलिटरी नहीं है इस समस्या का समाधान सेना या फौज नहीं है, इस समस्या का समाधान केवल राजनीतिक समाधान ही हो सकता है। लेकिन मैं विदेश मंत्री जी से पूछना चाहता हूं कि वह क्या कदम उठाने जा रहे हैं इस समस्या का राजनीतिक समाधान करने के लिए ?

बंगला देश में 1971 में भारत सरकार ने इन्दिरा गांधी जी के नेतृत्व में एक कड़ा कदम उठाया था और उस समय के बारे में विभिन्न रायें थीं कि वह कदम उचित था या अनुचित था, लेकिन आज जब हमारे देश में एक लाख तीस हजार शरणार्थी आ गये हैं और प्रेमदास जी जिस तरीके के वक्तव्य दे रहे हैं, तो इस सिलसिले में भारत सरकार की क्या प्रतिक्रिया है ?

आज भी मुझे समाचार-पत्रों में पढ़ने को मिला कि विगत शुक्रवार को श्रीलंका के राष्ट्रपति श्री जयवर्धने की हमारे देश के जो प्रधान मंत्री हैं, श्री राजीव गांधी, इनकी टेलीफोन पर करीब-करीब आधा घंटा बात हुई है। तो मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि आप संसद को बताने की कृपा करें कि उस बातचीत का, उस वार्तालाप का क्या नतीजा हुआ है और इस समस्या का कारगर समाधान करने के लिए भारत सरकार क्या कदम उठाने जा रही है ?

19 दिसम्बर, 1986 को एक प्रस्ताव रखा गया था जो कि कोलम्बो प्रस्ताव के नाम से जाना गया है। मैं यह भी जानना

[श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय]

चाहता हूं कि आखिर उस कोलम्बो प्रस्ताव के कार्यान्वयन के सिलसिले में भारत सरकार की ओर से क्या कदम उठाये जा रहे हैं ?

आज के समाचार-पत्रों में एक खबर आई है कि तमिल नाडु में कोई जगह है तिरुपुर, वहां पर भारत सरकार के जो राज्य मंत्री है, श्री चिदम्बरम जी, उन्होंने इस बात का वक्तव्य दिया है कि इस देश की संसद को जो श्रीलंका की वस्तुस्थिति है, उसके बारे में पूरी जानकारी अति शीघ्र कराई जाएगी। तो मैं यह भी जानना चाहता हूं कि जो चिदम्बरम, जी ने कल वक्तव्य तिरुपुर, तमिल नाडु में वक्तव्य के सिलसिले में उन्होंने जो आश्वासन दिया है उसकी पूर्ति कब की जाएगी और श्रीलंका के सिलसिले में कब इस देश की जनता को जानकारी कराई जाएगी क्योंकि श्रीलंका में यह बात बिल्कुल निर्विवाद है कि वहां के जो धार्मिक स्थल है, वहां पर जो मस्जिद है, वहां के जो मंदिर हैं और साथ-साथ वहां पर जो लाइब्रेरीज हैं, जो शिक्षण संस्थायें हैं, उनकी इमारतों को नष्ट किया जा रहा है और लोगों के साथ नर-संहार किया जा रहा है ।

इसलिए मैं चाहूंगा कि इस सिलसिले में भारत सरकार बराबर आश्वासन तो देती आई है, लेकिन कोरे आश्वासन से कुछ नहीं होना है। इसलिए मैं चाहूंगा कि भारत सरकार जो वहां पर मानव नर-संहार हो रहा है क्योंकि हमारी विदेश नीति है मानव अधिकारों का हनन न होने पाए, उसकी हम रक्षा करेंगे। आखिर इस विदेश नीति का कार्यान्वयन करने के लिए आप क्या कदम उठाने जा रहे हैं। बंगला देश की चर्चा आपकी इस पुस्तिका एनुअल रिपोर्ट में की गई : बंगला देश में वहां के जो बंगलादेश राइफल्स के लोग अत्याचार कर रहे हैं। और उस अत्याचार के फलस्वरूप करीब-करीब 50 हजार शरणार्थी त्रिपुरा में आ कर बसे हुए हैं। त्रिपुरा के मुख्य मंत्री नृपेन चक्रवर्ती जी ने कि मानवता के नाते हमने इन लोगों को वहा पर शरण दे दी है। मैं यह भी जानना चाहूंगा कि आखिर ये शरणार्थी चाहे श्रीलंका के हों, बंगला देश के हों, या और कहीं के भी हों जो हमारे देश में आकर बस जाते हैं और एक नई समस्या पैदा कर देते हैं इसके सिलसिले में आप क्या कदम उठाने जा रहे हैं और इनके संबंध मे क्या कार्यवाही सरकार की ओर से की जा रही है ? पाकिस्तान को लीजिए । पाकिस्तान में भी उग्रवादी और उनका संरक्षण हो रहा है उग्रवादियों को पाकिस्तान में ट्रेनिग दी जा रहीं है। पंजाब के सिलसिले में हमारे देश में जो वातावरण बना हुआ है वह एक तरीके से हमारी राष्ट्रीय एकता और अखंडता को खतरा है । पाकिस्तान उग्रवादियों को प्रशिक्षण दे रहा है उनको ट्रेनिग दे रहा है। बराबर इस बात को भारत सरकार ने भी स्वीकार किया है कि पंजाब में बहुत से उग्रवादी पाकिस्तान के कारण आ करके चले जाते हैं, कभी जम्मू-काश्मीर के रास्ते से चले जाते है, कभी किसी दूसरी सीमा के रास्ते से चले जाते हैं । इस सिललिले में आप क्या कदम उठाने जा रहे हैं ? काश्मीर का मामला खत्म हो चुका है बल्कि अंतिम रूप से निर्णय हो चुका है कि वह भारत का अविभाजित अंग है। लेकिन आज भी देखिए पाकिस्तान की सरकार बराबर काश्मीर के मसले को संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ में ले जाने की कोशिश कर रही है । आपने एनुअल रिपोर्ट में इस बात को स्वीकार भी किया है । काश्मीर के सिलसिले में दो मसले हैं एक तो वहां पर आजाद काश्मीर के नाम से जगह जानी जाती है और दूसरे इस वार्षिक रिपोर्ट में आपने इस बात की चर्चा की है:

"Efforts to improve relations with Pakistan met with negative developments with Pakistan's continuing assistance to terrorists in India. Persistance in their search for sophisticated weapons, including an AWACS

type capability, attempts to raise the Kashmir question at international fora and their reluctance to develop trade on a non-discriminatory basis."

तो मैं यह जानना चाहूंगा कि इस रिपोर्ट में आपने इस बात की चर्चा तो की कि काश्मीर के मसले को पाकिस्तान संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ के फोरम पर ले जाने की कोशिश कर रहा है । लेकिन यह जो आजाद काश्मीर का हिस्सा है उसके सिलसिले में भारत सरकार की क्या राय है इस बारे में सदन को जानकारी देने की कृपा करें अंत में एक बात की ओर ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूं जनवरी 1987 में जिसकी आपने यहां पर चर्चा की है कि पाकिस्तानी सेना की हरकतों से भारत-पाकिस्तान सीमा पर काफी तनाव उत्पन्न हो गया और हाल में इस बात की जानकारी हुई है कि अमरीका की सीनेट ने इस बात का प्रस्ताव किया है कि वह पाकिस्तान को नई सैन्य या आर्थिक सहायता देगा । वह आर्थिक सहायता करीब 4 अरब डालर के बीच होगी। इससे निश्चित रूप से भारत की एकता सुरक्षा और अखंडता को खतरा उत्पन्न होने जा रहा है मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि इस सिलसिले में भारत सरकार की क्या प्रतिक्रिया है । अंत में मैं फिर इस सदन के माध्यम से आपसे अनुरोध करना चाहता हूं कि सन 1962 का जो इस देश की संसद का प्रस्ताव है उसको कार्यान्वियन करने में आखिर आप को क्या दिक्कत है । चीन से हमारे संबंध अच्छे होने चाहिए । मैं इस बात को नहीं कह रहा हूं कि चीन से झगड़ करके चीन से अपने रिश्ते को बिगाड करके इस समस्या का समाधान कर सकते हैं लेकिन मेरा आपसे अनुरोध है कि आखिर जो इस भारत की संसद का 1962 का सर्वसम्मत प्रस्ताव है इसको कार्यान्वित करने में आपको क्या दिक्कत है, क्या कठिनाई है? इस बात में आपको तनिक भी शक और शुबह नहीं होनी चाहिए कि इस सरकार की चलती विदेश नीति के कारण ही आज हमारे रिश्ते पाकिस्तान से खराब हैं, बंगलादेश से बहुत अच्छे नहीं है, चीन से भी अच्छे नहीं है, नेपाल से भी अच्छे नहीं है और हमारे रिश्ते भूटान से भी अच्छे नहीं हैं । देश के जितने भी सीमावर्ती देश हैं, इसके जितने भी सीमावर्ती पड़ौसी मुल्क हैं, उनसे अगर हमारे रिश्ते अच्छे नहीं है तो इसका कारण यह है कि आपकी जो विदेश नीति है, उसके कार्यान्वियन में निश्चित रूप में कहीं न कहीं खराबी है या जिन लोगों के हाथ में है, वह लोग असफल रहे है...(समय की घंटी...)

उपसभापति : आप समाप्त कीजिए :

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय : मैं समाप्त कर रहा हूं । मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि अपनी विदेश नीति को कार्यान्वित करने के लिए आप अच्छी तरह से, अच्छे तरीके से अपना इंतजाम सोचिए और उसमें सुधार भी कीजिए ।

महोदया, अन्त में दो बात कहकर मैं अपनी बात को समाप्त करूंगा । यह कोई बहुत अच्छी परिपाटी नहीं है कि ऐसे पत्रकार-सम्मेलन में, जिसमें कि विदेशी पत्रकार भी उपस्थित हों और विदेश सचिव भी वहां उपस्थित हों उनकी मौजूदगी में देश के प्रधानमंत्री इस बात की घोषणा करें कि विदेश सचिव अब अपने पद से हटाए जाने वाले हैं । प्रधानमंत्री के इस काम से हमारे देश की जो छवि है वह विदेशों में धूमिल हुई है । मुझे आशा है कि इस सम्बन्ध में प्रधानमंत्री भविष्य में सजगता से काम लेंगे और इस तरीके से काम करेंगे कि विदेश में भारत की छवि धूमिल न हो। धन्यवाद ।

DR. H. P. SHARMA (Rajasthan): Mr. Deputy Chairman, the basic parameters of India's foreign policy were laid down four decades ago and they still continue to enjoy the same relevance that they did forty years ago. Even at the cost of repetition, I will say that we decided to preserve India's sovereign independence, pursue an independent foreign policy, without aligning ourselves with the power-blocs. We are opposed to imperialism,

[Dr. H. P. Sharma]

colonialism and racialism and we are for refashioning the existing economic system into a new equitable international economic order.

Madam, while the basic tenets of our foreign policy are sound, I cannot, in all honesty, say that the last year was very fruitful in achieving our avowed national objectives at least in the measure or to the extent that we hoped we would be achieving. The principles of non-alignment struggle for emancipation from all forms of colonialism, dismantling of the apparatus of apartheid etc. are all very laudable objectives. But we must be very realistic.

On the positive side, India's Chairmanship of the non-aligned movement for three years gave a distinguished and positive lead to the resolution of major issues of the non-aligned community leading up to Harare and our efforts specially in the evolution of the new economic order or in regard to south-south co-operation did further these objectives.

To give concrete shape to our support to the frontline States, the Africa Fund was established and India was elected as the Chairman of the Fund. The Committee held its meeting in January in New Delhi wherein India itself made a very handsome contribution of Rs. 50 crores for the next three years. Again, Madam, the report goes on to say about the dignitaries who visited India. I would like to mention about the visits of two. Mr. Oliver Tambo of the African National Congress and Mr. Sam Najuma, President of the SWAPO. Madam, the question I wish to ask here is, what inhibits the Government from granting recognition to the African National Congress in the same way we have done in the case of the SWAPO in Namibia? Is it some kind of a consideration that we being a part of the Commonwealth, we will lose whatever leverage we have with the Commonwealth if we take an independent stance? I would like to submit, in all sincerity, that it is time the Government thinks very seriously about granting recognition to the African National congress.

Another prominent focus of India's efforts has been to work for disarmament. Towards that, we, along with five other nations, took the initiative in appealing to the super-powers for disarmament. Following upon this, Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi and Mr. Gorbachov gave the Delhi Declaration. While these are very laudable initiatives, there is a danger that we may be carried away by our rhetoric. By this I do not mean that in any way we should dilute much less to forsake the principles of non-alignment. Madam, there is a gap between the realism and sometimes the pursuit of this laudable policy initiative.

Madam, the country's image is important, but nations cannot live on image alone. We must try to secure our national objectives. I will here quote Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, not fully but part of it. Non-alignment is a creative concept and not a substitute for active and dynamic pursuit of what Pandit Nehru described as "enlightened self-interest." This is the anvil, I suppose, on which the success or failure , or shortcomings of our foreign policy must be judged.

Madam, we have had our internal probelms and perhaps these have given rise to the other countries not to give as much serious thought to our moves as they should be doing. The problems are all known, like Punjab, Gorkhaland or the communal division that is demonstrating itself in Rama-Janma Bhoomi, Babri Masjid, etc. Other countries take stock of our internal strength and these are the factors which are diminishing our cohesiveness and strength. Other countries are certainly taking stock of this.

Now Madam, I will come to Bangladesh. It has already been mentioned that there were 50,000 Chakmas who have crossed over to India from Chittagong Hill tracts. I have some disturbing facts about the genesis of Chakmas' flight. I wish the Minister would throw some light on this. Of course, it started with the settling of the Muslims from the plains in predominantly non-Muslim

hill areas, but what is disturbing is that there was pressure mounted on these ethnic Hindus and Buddhist tribals to embrace Islam. I may be wrong, but on that I would like the Minister to throw some light and give facts. Then, again in 1972 the Bangladesh Constitution itself was amended to make possible the two processes. In the amendment it is said that the ethnic tribals were re-designated as Bengali Muslims. What is disturbing is that now we are asking the Chakmas to go back. We are agreeing that there will be a sort of push-back but if these are true facts, then we have to give a serious consideration to all these things. I do not wish to go into the Amnesty International or our own study where they have said that the Chakmas fled in dire circumstances to escape from extra-judicial executions by Banglade h army and para-military forces. Bangladesh is our close neighbour. We have so many interests in common, whether it is the Ganga river waters or other interests. We would like to have very happy relationship, but this problems should not be allowed to grow out of proportion.

We know what happened when refugees came from what is now called Bangladesh or Eastern Pakistan. We did not know how much problem it would create later on. So, I would only request the Minister or the Government to take serious note of this and give serious attention to this.

Now I will come to Pakistan. Pakistan was a strife-torn neighbour sometime ago. It was faced with virtual disintegration. Now what is the position of Pakistan? Pakistan has very much gained internal strength as well as the world profile. It is in a very happy bargaining position with the two Super Powers courting her arduously. It must be mentioned that it was a lucky sequence of events which Pakistan used intelligently and that did come to help Pakistan which was, as I said, tottering virtually at a disintegration stage, to become today a power which is courted by both the Super Powers. The sequence of lucky events which I will enumerate in passing, started with the exist of the Iranian Shah and of course, the oil-lanes, more than half the world reserevs of oil-lanes in that area. The U.S. was looking desperately in search of somebody to replace the Shah of Iran at the same time. At the same time Soviet invasion of Afghanistan took place in 1979. It certainly increased the value of Paikstan's affimation that they would take the cause of the Islamic Mujahideens and they offered themselves to function as a conduit for US arms. Pakistan has cultivated itself as an indispensable strategic partner of USA. I do not think it serves much purpose either abusing Pakistan or the USA. We must, talking of foreign relations, think cool-headedly and objectively. If they have their strategic interests coincide, just calling them names or using intemperate language does not solve this country's problems. What I wish to say is that Pakistan has certainly used these things very intelligently. It secured a 6 billion dollar worth of economic aid in 1981 and it is going to secure a 4.2 billion dollar aid. It is as good as given. Even after the stipulation that every two years.... (*Time bell rings*). Madam people have taken 20 minutes. Kindly bear with me for a few minutes more.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can take some time more. It is just a warning.

DR. H. P. SHARMA: Pakistan has played the game of Geneva proximity talks to the hilt. Talking to the Soviet Union, they have tried to say at these proximity talks, "we will give our serious attention to the Soviet Union's proposals or interests". This game has been played verey very astutely by Pakistan. Pakistan has managed with considerable diplomatic finesse to preserve and strengthen strategic ties with the USA.

Coming to the Soviet Union, they have kept the Soviet Union guessing about their intentions regarding Afghanistan whether they are going to help Soviet Union get off the hook, or they will continue to keep their defence ties with the USA. They have played this game very cleverly. Apparently Pakistan went through the motions of improving relations with the Soviet Union, while at the same time it was passing assurances

[Dr. H. P. Sharma]

to the United States that Pakistan will be taking only a principled stand on Afghanistan.

Madam, since you are ringing the bell, I will say only one thing about Pakistan. I would like to mention that Pakistan is very clever in projecting itself as a nuclear ambiguity. They do not say that they have the atom bomb. They do not say also that they do not have it. Even President Zia in the interview to the *Time* magazine said, they have the nuclear capability and again at the last moment said, they don't have the bomb. I think it is a very clever game of getting advantage from both sides.

Madam, I would just hurry through. Our main problem with China is, I think, that the nexus between China and Pakistan must be taken for granted. You cannot break it. That is at least the way I see it. And also it will not be easy to secure an easy break-through in the boundary question resolution. We must be prepared for a long hot summer for further resolution of this problem. It has already been said that China's objection to our granting statehood to Arunachal Pradesh and their even threatening of serious consequences are totally inadmissible.

The talks between China and Soviet Russia again create problems for us, despite Moscow's assurance to this country that its interests will be taken care of. Here it will be imprudent if we fail to take notice of this development. Nor should we exaggerate this Sino-Soviet rapprochement and panic into anticipating a major change in the Soviet policy. That would be a blunder.

I will hurry through, Madam. Our problems with Nepal and Bhutan are perhaps more because of China. 5.00 P.M. There is a gradual challenge to our special relationship with Bhutan and Nepal, both. In its negotiations with Bhutan, China is pressing for the opening of a Chinese embassy in Thimpu and across the border talks with Tibet in return for a boundary agreement. Uptil now our relationship with Bhutan has been entirely different and China certainly is trying to open an embassy there. It will be giving a totally different colour to the whole picture. Again, there was an interview that the King of Bhutan gave to a German journalist where it is said that in case of a conflict between China and India, Bhutan will remain neutral. What is means, Madam Deputy Chairman, I just leave it for the Minister.

About Nepal, in passing I would just say that on 14th April they started this work permit order. Ostensibly this order was meant for all, but in practical terms the main sufferers are we, Indians. But I do not want to mention about the one thousand or five thousand people who are getting into problems. What I am afraid of and of which I want to caution the Minister and the Government is that this is an attempt to dilute the 1950 Indo-Nepalese Treaty. That is the basic thrust which we must guard against. One more point is that the Nepalese zone of peace again comes in the same ambit of discussion and we should be careful.

The last point is about Ceylon. So much has been said about Ceylon. I can not add too much but there are two points. Not solving the Ceylon issue is one. Of course, as they say, it takes two to tango, and unless they are forthcoming for a resolution of the problem, there can be no solution. But it is going to be and proving to be very costly to us. Apart from the inhuman torture that the Tamil ethnic part of Ceylon's population is put to, now, to us in the more wider geo-centric, geo-strategic terms, I think we are paying a very heavy price and we should try to solve it. It is easy for me and you to say so, but I know how difficult it is. But still it must be done, and that is my request. Thank you.

SHRI DEBA PRASAD RAY (West Bengal): Honourable Deputy Chairperson, I rise to participate in the debate on the working of the Ministry of External Affairs. India's foreign policy has to be viewed in the backdrop of the global political situation that is prevailing today. The whole world is clamouring for peace and the major function of the present world is how to preserve peace in the global arena.

Never before had India's role been so distinguishable in the international peace movement as it has been today. While Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, one of the founding fathers of the Non-Aligned Movement, was being considered as the propagator of the peace movement and Indiraji was being considered as the defender of the peace movement, Rajivji has proved to be the crusader for peace and disarmament in the global arena. It is really remarkable, it is really gratifying, that in such a short span of time he has been able to distinguish himself as one of the most outstanding world leaders and has attained this height in such a short span of time and, on his elevation to this position, the country's position has been heightened, the country's position has been elevated and for which I take this opportunity to compliment him.

We have been fighting for the cause of peace in the global arena. But the concept of peace has also to be understood in the real perspective. The concepts of peace and freedom are indivisible concepts. As long as there is even one country left without freedom in the global arena or in any part of the world, we cannot say that peace has been achieved in the real sense of the term, and that is why India has been fighting for the liberation of countries like Namibia and South Africa. India has been fighting for the liberation of EL Salvador. And because of this, India has stood by those countries where freedom is threatened by imperialist forces. That is why India has stood by Nicaragua. India has stood by Polisario in Western Sahara. India has expressed support for the freedom of struggling nations which are being subjugated by imperialist forces.

Madam, the concept of peace has also to be understood in the real perspective. The concept of peace and the concept of development are also indivisible concepts. As long as there is poverty and unemployment in any part of the world, as long as there is hunger and poverty in any part of the world, we cannot claim that peace has been achieved in the real sense of the term. And that is why India has been fighting for the cause of those countries which are being exploited by the developed countries. Today the developing countries are struggling for economic development.

There is a concept today, the concept of foreign aid, the concept of economic co-operation. But I must say that this concept of co-operation and foreign aid is based on the concept of global exploitation. We are under the illusion that the developed countries are helping the undeveloped and developing countries for their economic development. To explain my point, I intend to cite one example. In 1984-85 the developed countries extended co-operation, economic co-operation to the undeveloped countries to the tune of dollar 80 billion. While giving this co-operation to the undeveloped and developing countries, they took away from those countries a sum of dollar 96 billion in the form of interest on the old debts. So, in the global arena what is happening in the name of providing aid and co-operation to the undeveloped and developing countries is that exploitation is being perpetuated, exploitation is being continued. India has fought against this exploitation. The initiative was taken by Smt. Indira Gandhi when she participated in the North-South dialogue, when she attended the Cancun Summit. And today India has proved to be the greatest exponent of this concept which is called the new international economic order, which means that the development of co-operation in the economic field must be based on the concept of equality.

The concept of peace has also to be understood in relation to the concept of disarmament. As long as there is threat of war, as long as there is the threat of destruction, there cannot be peace in the real sense of the term. That is why India has been fighting for the total disarmament in the global arena. If you look at the world situation today, never before was the world situation so explosive as it is today. In 1986 alone a sum of $ 975 billion had been spent for military purposes. Even if 10 per cent of the total arms stock is used today then, there would be a nuclear winter for six months. And there is a nuclear winter for six months in the world, one can jolly well imagine what the fate of the humanity would be, what fate of the mankind would be.

[Shri Deba Prasad Ray]

So, India has been fighting for disarmament. India has been fighting for disarmament also because of the fact that the resources that have been spent for military purposes, and if those resources are spent for the development purposes, it would be possible for the world to take away the word "poverty" from the dictionary of mankind. India has shown that commitment. India, under the leadership of Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, hon. Prime Minister, has shown this commitment in the global arena. That is why we take this opportunity to pay compliment, to congratulate him.

For the struggle we have undertaken in the global arena we have been made to pay a price. Its cost was quite considerable. The forces of destabilisation, the imperialist forces who are worried about the role that India has been playing in the global arena for the preservation of peace and disarmament, are now trying to destabilise this country.

If you look at the map of India, you will see that in the north of our country there is a country called China which is not prepared to recognise Arunachal Pradesh as an integral part of our country, which is now propping up rebel forces and extremist forces in the north-eastern part of our country to cause further harm to the integrity of our nation, which is now trying to support Pakistan to occupy an integral part of our country, that is, Siachin.

If you look to the west, there is a country called Pakistan. It is getting arms and ammunition from America everyday and which is now preparing to attack India at any point of time.

If you look to the east of our country, there is one country called Bangladesh which is not prepared to allow India to close the border with barbed wire despite the fact that there is infiltration everyday from Bangladesh into Assam, to Tripura, into Bengal. If you look at the southern part of the country, you will see there is a tiny island called Sri Lanka whose military power in term of number of personnel is not more than 10,000. If there is any war to be fought with Sri Lanka tomorrow, I would say, in my personal capacity without involving the Government of India, India would not be required to send its Army. If the total police force of Tamil Nadu is sent to Sri Lanka, within ten minutes Sri Lanka could be conquered. But it is also mustering courage to defy India's suggestion to find a political solution to its ethnic problem. Now, it is noticed that they are calling India as enemy, a country which is trying to find a political solution to their problem. We know for certain whether it is Pakistan or Bangladesh, whether it is Bangladesh or Sri Lanka for that matter, behind all these forces there is one face and that is the face of the US imperialism, which is trying to destabilise India and to create problems for India so that India is deterred from its commitment to the path of peace and disarmament and from its commitment to the path of non-alignment. This conspiracy has been hatched against India which has to be understood by the whole country today. After failing to stall India's march towards socialism by creating problems from outside, these foreign forces are now trying to make India's internal situation vulnerable. We have paid the highest price for our commitments when our great leader Shrimati Indira Gandhi had to sacrifice her life for the preservation of the unity of the nation. It would be a mistake to presume that her killing was an isolated episode. It was the same force which killed Mujibur Rehman in Bangladesh; it was the same force which got Bhutto hanged in Pakistan; it was the same force which got Srimavo Bhandaranaike removed from power in Sri Lanka. The same force got Indira Gandhi assassinated in the land of India but with one difference. While with the assassination of Mujibur Rehman the voice of democracy was throttled in Bangladesh and with the execution of Bhutto the voice against imperialism was silenced in Pakistan and with the installation of Jayawerdene in Sri Lanka, Sri Lanka became a stooge of American imperialism, in India even after Mrs. Gandhi was killed India's march towards socialism could not be thwarted;

India's commitment towards non-alignment and India's commitment to peace and disarmament could not be thwarted. Rajiv Ji, the saviour of the nation, took the flag from the hands of dying mother and undertook the journey from where she had left. We take this opportunity to express our solidarity with him once again because of the struggle that he has undertaken. Today the crisis has deepened. The crisis has aggravated. The conspiracy has been deepened. And if we look at the situation persisting in our sub-continent, we will find that an army base has been put up in Peshawar in Pakistan, an army base has been put up in Chittagong in Bangladesh and an army base has been put up in Trincomalee in Sri Lanka. A death triangle has been laid to destabilise India. But even after these conspiracies the imperialist forces have realised that they cannot deter India from its journey towards socialism, they cannot deter India from its fight for preservation of peace and disarmament. Therefore, an effort is being made to actually create a problem inside the country. One does not take time to understand as to which are the forces which are behind the Khalistan movement in our country when one comes to know that training of extremists was imparted in the Campers school in Alabama and extremism was spread in the land of Punjab. One does not take time to realise which are the forces that are behind the extremist movement in Punjab, when one comes to know from the statement made by Sarabjit Singh, the extremist, in his confessional statment that 500 young Sikhs were being trainied in Pakistan to spread extremism in the land of Punjab. If they are still there. I can take the responsibility, let them come back to India, we will send them back to their respective places, to their respective mothers who had been missing their sons and children and we would intend to teach Pakistan a lesson once more. We had fought against Pakistan in 1965 and taught a lesson. We fought against Pakistan in 1971 and we got Bangladesh liberated. If at all a situation demands and if war has to be fought against Pakistan tomorrow we may also ensure that Zia regime in Pakistan is permanently done away with. We are not scared of Pakistan. We are not scared of Pakistan because of the fact that it is receiving arms and ammunition from the United States every day. Even in yesterday's newspaper reports it is said that U.S. administration has declined to limit arms supply to Pakistan. But that does not scare us because we know that India is invincible as far as Pakistan is concerned. Even the U.S. administration also knows that India cannot be defeated by Pakistan (*Time bell rings*). Even then US administration is supplying arms and ammunition to Pakistan. Why? This conspiracy has to be understood. This imperialist conspiracy has to be understood. The more arms and ammunition are supplied to Pakistan the more India would be compelled to buy more arms and ammunition, thereby there would be scarcity of resources for the developmental purposes. That is the imperialist conspiracy today. What initiative India has taken? The initiative that India took in the matter of preserving and in the matter of ensuring disarmament could be understood from the fact that six-nation summit was held at our instance itself. It could be understood from the fact that the New Delhi declaration has urged upon super-powers to do away with arms race. It could be understood from the fact that India has tried to protect the people of South Africa when it participated in the Commonwealth meeting and ensured that Britain was isolated. On the issue of apartheid it could mobilise the world opinion to stand by the people of South Africa. The contribution made by India in the international arena for the preservation of peace and for the reduction of arms race have to be understood in the right perspective. I would like to point out that some of our friends have been saying and some of our friends have been arguing that we should try to normalise relations with our neighbours. I agree with them. But as far as India is concerned, there is no dearth of effort in this regard and that has been substantiated from the fact that SAARC has been formed. Formation of SAARC is a move in this direction and our relations with Bhutan and Maldives are quite cordial. Our relations with Nepal are not any acrimonious either. But I would like to put a question to those friends who say that we should try to normalise the situation: Should

[Shri Deba Prasad Ray]

we try to normalise the situation at the cost of our commitment to socialism and democracy in the national arena? Should we try to normalise the situation at the cost of our commitment for peace and disarmament in the international arena? (*Time bell rings*). Madam, I seldom speak. Give me one more minute. Should we try to normalise the situation at the cost of our commitment to those ideals which have been upheld by India for ages? I would like to request my friends to appreciate this aspect and to stand by this Government to enable this Government to pursue the causes that are being pursued by India and which has enabled India to distinguish its role in the global arena.

I would like to say that for every major struggle, the price has to be paid. For every major cause, sacrifice has to be made. Even if the situation demands for larger sacrifice, we should not give up the journey. Let the journey towards socialism be on. Let the struggle for the preservation of peace in the international areas be on. I would like to conclude my speech by quoting two lines from Tagore's poem. "Tomar Hate Nai Bhubaner Bhar, ore Bhiru, Haler Kache Majhi Achhe Korbe Tori Paar, ore Bhiru". For the convenience of those who do not understand Bengali, I would like to give English translation also. Cowards, you cannot be entrusted with the responsibility of taking care of the world. There is a sailor on the deck. who would definitely take the boat across the sea. You repose your confidence and faith in him. He will take the boat across the sea. I would like to appeal to our friends to repose their faith and confidence in the great sailor of the country today, Shri Rajiv Gandhi who will definitely take the boat across the sea however stormy the journey may be. With these words, I conclude. Thank you.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: (Tamil Nadu): Madam Deputy Chairman, I was listening to the speech of my friend, Shri D.P. Ray who described our hon. Prime Minister as a great sailor. But I am pained to say that as far as the question of Sri Lanka is concerned, they have been left in the mid-sea by our hon. Prime Minister, the sea of blood and tears as quoted by my leader, Dr. Karunanidhi. Madam, of course, the time at my disposal is short but I crave your indulgence. I would not take much time of the House but I will confine myself to the problem of the Sri Lankan Tamils. Madam, our Prime Minister has stated that India expresses anguish but I would like to say this anguish will never extinguish the fire of racist system, the fire of genocide which is devouring the precious lives of Tamils in Sri Lanka. I am pained to say that the anguished cry of a slaughtered Tamil race in the island of Sri Lanka has fallen on deaf ears of the Government of India. I may be excused by Mr. N. D. Tiwari, a good friend of mine as I am bound to say that the Tamils have been betrayed by this Government since 1948. The other day, the Prime Minister of Sri Lanka, Mr. Prema Dasa stated on the floor of the Parliament of Sri Lanka that any friend, who tells us to find a political solution will be considered as the biggest enemy. He further said that we could not betray our people because we want friendship with India. I am jealous of these Sinhalese people. They have got a Prime Minister who is bold enough to declare on the floor of the Parliament of the country that we do not want friendship with India because we may be betraying our own people. But what happened in our country? This Government has betrayed our own people who happen to be the citizens of this country, The Tamils since 1948 just because they want friendship with Sri Lanka if India wanted to build up friendship with Sri Lanka. I do not understand why Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the architect of our foreign policy, for whom I have got great respect and regard and whom I consider a democrat to the marrow of his bones, why he had failed, why he had kept mum, why he remained silent when the most obnoxious legilsation was passed in the Sri Lankan Parliament dis-enfranchising one million Tamils i.e. 10 lakhs. That obnoxious legislation of the Sri Lankan Government, with one stroke, made one million Tamils orphans. This particular category of Tamils because there are two categories. There are two categories of people. One category is of the native Tamils and their original homeland is in the northern and eastern part

of Sri Lanka. They are the inhabitants there right from the down of history and from time immemorial they have been there. The second category is of those persons who migrated from South India, those who were taken by the British estate and other estate owners for plantation purposes. They went there. They shed their blood, they shed their sweat and they shed their tears there for the prosperity of that Island. They conributed to the prosperity of that Island for fifty years, sixty years and a hundred years. After all these years, one fine morning, the Parliment there says, "You do not have the franchise, you do not have the voting right". What for India kept quiet? I cannot understand it at all. Because you wanted friendship with Sri Lanka. That is what I feel. Whenever and wherever human rights were violated, our great Nehru stood up and raised his voice. But when the rights of the Tamils were violated, when their rights were denied, we kept quiet then in the year 1948. Madam, what happened later? The present scenario in the international situation is not at all happy and our relations particularly with our neighbours today are not at all satisfactory. Our relations with Pakistan, China, Burma, even Bangladesh, with all these neighbouring countries, are not at all satisfactory. I am not blaming this Government for this. Pakistan is arming itself and China is intruding into Arunachal Pradesh. Our relations with our neighbours started deteriorating much earlier. After 1959, our relations with China started deteriorating, after we raised the slogan "Hindi-Chini Bhai Bhai" in the Bandung Conference and our relations with China deteriorated further after 1962. Our relations with Pakistan too deterorated. But, Madam, just to have friendship with a tiny neighbouring country, that is, the Island of Sri Lanka, what did we do? We did a great and unpardonable blunder of entering into a pact or treaty with Sri Lanka in the year 1964 with the commitment to take back 5,25,000 persons as citizens of India, as repatriates. What business you had, what right you had, to do that? They went there and they contributed to the prosperity of that country. But you compromised and at the cost of the prosperity of the Tamils there you entered into a treaty with Sri Lanka in the year 1964. Madam, in the year 1963, on the 12th December, a very important decision was taken by the Union Cabinet when Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was the Prime Minister and it was this: There was a long-pending demand to have a navigational route between the eastern coast and the western coast without the necessary of having to go round Sri Lanka and the Sethusamudram Canal Project for this purpose, for which there had been a demand, a persistent demand, for many many years, was cleared in the Union Cabinet. If that project had been implemented then as per the decision of the Union Cabinet, today ships need not have to go via Sri Lanka within the striking range of Trincomalee. I am asking you only to look at this problem from a different angle, from the defence point of view and from the strategic point of view. Then why was it not implemented? With a heavy heart I have to say that because Sri Lanka would lose heavily its trade and its foreign exchange and its economy would be totally destroyed. According to renable information, what happened was that they persuaded this Government not to take up this project at all. That is why the project which was cleared by the Union Government was not at all implemented. Is it not a betrayal? Is it not a failure of your policy? So all these years, 1948, 1963 and then 1964—Tamils have been betrayed this genocide started right from 1958. I have spoken umpteen number of times on the floor of this House, not for any political ends. I have shed tears on the floor of this House when my people were getting killed. But today what is happening? Premadasa says: you are the biggest enemy. A tiny country is bold enough to challenge you. This very same Premadasa declared four or five years back that even a hundred Indians will not be able to subjugate Sri Lanka. I warned you many times on the floor of the House about this racist regime headed by Jayawardene: Do not believe them. He will strentch his hand, he will give his hand. But do not shake your hands with him. That hand is full of blood. I have told you umpteen number of times. Now today, Premadasa comes and says: you are

[Shri V. Gopalsamy]

their biggest enemy. Yesterday Jayewardene said: I am for peace. Madam, I would like to beg this Government: Open your eyes to see what is going on there. You suddenly reacted when the blaze in Colombo was reported. You suddenly reacted. Then what prevented you when bombing was going on Tamils there day in and day out, continuously? Women, children and even the sick in hospitals were killed. Madam, I am terribly disturbed at the attitude of certain journalists and Pressmen of this country. I am always for the freedom of the Press. I have suffered jail. I have suffered imprisonment to uphold, to protect, the freedom of the Press, for the fundamental rights during the dark days of emergency. But I am pained to see the attitude of certain Pressmen and journalists, when they are branding our own people, our Tamils, as butchers. Yes, they will become butchers to face the cannibals. All these years they did not take up arms, before 1972. Even Mahatma Gandhi justified violence. What could they do? Even if you push a cat to the corner, it will pounce upon you. Before their own eyes when their mothers were raped, when their wives were raped, when their children were thrown into flames, they took up arms finally.

Madam, today the situation is very grave. Whatever we speak here these fiery speeches, will not ward off the bullets which are piercing our own people. But, Madam, I would beg this Government to look at this problem from a different angle. I say today that the danger to Indian security is not from Pakistan, is not from the north, is not from the north-east, but I say that the danger to the security of this country is from the Indian Ocean. The imperialist forces already there are using Diego Garcia as base. They are already enjoying there the facility of getting fuel and oil in Trincomalee Harbour. The eyes of the entire U.S.A. are focussed on Trincomalee, because Napoleon said: If I conquer Trincomalee I can conquer the whole of Asia; because Trincomalee is a strategic centre in the Indian Ocean. The entire Harbour of Trincomalee is the homeland of Tamils. You have committed a very grave blunder. You have tried to be friendly with Sri Lanka because of your weak-kneed policy because of your lame duck policy nearly 10 lakh Tamils have been driven away. They have vacated their houses. There is Sinhalese colonisation in Sri Lanka which is supported by State terrorism. The Tamils have been driven away. Trincomalee is the homeland of Tamils. The Americans are very keen to have access to Trincomalee. That is why it is the U.S. Government which permitted the Israelis to open their special interest's section office in the U. S. Embassy. It is to allow them to operate freely. Madam, the Tamils are being driven away from *Trincomalee. If Trincomalee becomes* another Diego Garcia, the danger is very grave for us. It is very serious for the security and defence of this country. Their battleships and naval ships will be moving freely. Even now they are moving freely. It has become a base. So the danger is there. Take it from me that Sri Lanka will never become your friend. A Sinhalese Sri Lanka will never become your friend. But Tamils naturally will stand by your side. They will be by your side because 50 million tamils are citizens of India. It is high time to realise the reality of the situation and to support the Tamils. What for? I do not know what conversation took place between our own hon. Prime Minister and Jayewardene over telephone. We should be enlightened as to what took place.

Madam, this is the 'Hindu' Editorial of Saturday, April 25. It will be very pertient and proper to quote a few lines from it. It is a wonderful editorial, a significant editoral. It says:

> "...Official Indian policy lies, if not in shambles, in a state of passive adhocism, confusion and ineptness. But what has become obvious is that the Rajiv Gandhi policy towards Sri Lanka has got into this situation because it has attempted superficially and incompetently, to find a quick fix without a coherent framework of solidarity with the oppressed people.

As a direct result of all this, and given the switch-off-switchon style,

official Indian policy was equivocated and wavered. It has tended to equate the victims of the crisis—the Sri Lankan Tamils—with the aggressors—the Government of Sri Lanka and its allies, internal and external...

The disturbing information available is this. At the Minister of State level, according to Sri Lankan Tamil sources, the message was conveyed to the LTTE chief, Mr. V. Prabhakaran, in Bangalore and elsewhere in late 1986, that the Jayewardene Government had virtually threatened to kill thousands of Tamil civilians in pursuit of a military solution, unless a quick political settlement could be worked out and that India, given its policy perspective, would not be able to do anything about this. It was also suggested that the "Seventh Fleet" might enter the picture if a quick deal with not struck, and that the Government of India would be helpless in the face of this development."

"This line attempted to push a series of formulae and package deals down the throat of the Tamil militants...."

This is a disturbing question, Madam. I want a categorical answer for this question from our hon. Minister of External Affairs. This is what appeared in the editorial. It is true that it is nothing but blackmail of Tamils. We should not forget the lessons of history. Col. Gaddafi of Libya could not be brow-beaten by the US imperialists. Of course, he is from a very small country. Ho Chi Minh could not be brow-beaten. When you say the Seventh Fleet or something else or that the US may intervene and civilians may be killed and that they should come for a negotiation. This is sheer blackmail. Madam, political solution is not at all possible.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sum up.

SHRI VALAMPURI JOHN: He is summing up.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Political solution through a negotiating table, through a dialogue will never become a possibility. I don't wish that. But I am telling what is going to happen. Whatever I predicted, whatever I forewarned has come true because the Sinhalese are not sincere. And the Tamils could not live like a subejct race, like Roman slaves. They could not live like Roman slaves. They could not tolerate the persecution and oppression and slavery at the hands of another race. Madam, today, when I was watching many of the Paintings of historic events which have been affixed on the side walls of this Parliament, I was standing before the Paintins Panel No. 57 which is just before your Chamber, Madam. The painting, the Panel No. 57 shows how Rajendra Chola of 11th century with his mighty naval forces took an expedition and invaded Sri Lanka. Mr. Foreign Minister, not for the purpose of conquering did Rajendra Chola take his mighty navy, which was praised by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in his "Glimpses of the World History". When the Tamils who had their own kingdom were attacked by the Sinhalese, when their kingdom was attacked, when they were attacked by the Sinhalese, the Chola kind took his powerful navy to Sri Lanka to protect the Tamils. He conquered them, he conquered the Sinhalese. Today we are with you. Yes. In full faith we are the citizens of this country. But you keep quiet as an idle spectator when our own kith and kin are butchered and thrown to the death valley of starvation. Madam, now a days after dusk, they do not see any light at all there. They do not see any light because of the economic blockade. They have only one meal a day. Madam, they have no kerosene, no electricity and no light. They are living in darkness. And everyday, day and night, they are killed. And you are keeping quiet. By religion, by language, by tradition and by custom, the 50 million Tamils are one. When I say this thing, some of my friends say, 'why do you say that it is a Tamil problem? It is the problem of India.' Then you act like that. Mr. A. P. Venkateswaran, the former Foreign Secretary of this country has correctly stated that had it happened to any of the northern States, things should have been different. It may be bitter if I say this. But it is a fact. Had it happened somewhere in UP or Madhya Pradesh or Bihar or anywhere near, then Delhi would be burning if you do not take action. But we are unfortunate

[Shri V. Gopalsamy]

creatures because we are Tamils, because we are far away from this place.

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO (Jammu and Kashmir): We are Indians.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Then you act like that. If you are Indians, if you consider Tamils as Indians, what for you are keeping your Navy, what for you are keeping your Armed Forces, what for you are keeping your Defence forces? That is why I said what Rajendra Chola did that day. I may accept your national integration today. But my sons, my grand-sons, our posterity will not accept that if you do not act. (*Interruption*) Intervene immediately. It may be bitter to you. Intervene. What is wrong in that? That is why you may murmur, you may whisper, you may not accept, but in the long run I warn you, if you think even my suggestion is not tolerated by you, even my suggestion of sending army and defence forces to protect our people, to stop the killings is not tolerated by you, then our posterity will watch how the Indian Parliament reacted, how the people from the North reacted. If you want us in the present-day map of India, then you immediately intervenue. You come out openly to support our people, the militants. You may call them terrorists. In that case Bhagat Singh was a terrorist. In that case Subhash Chandra Bose was a terrorist because imperialists branded him a terrorist. If you want to help them, you come out openly, supply arms to our militants. Openly support them. What is wrong in it when genocide is going on. Madam Gandhi admitted on the floor of the House and said what is going on in Sri Lanka is nothing but genocide. Genocide is not an internal matter. Ganocide is not at all an internal matter of any country.

Madam, I do not understand the rationale behind our Indian foreign policy. You say something about South Africa. But in South Africa there is only racial segregation. Here in Sri Lanka racial liquidation is taking place whereas in South Africa only racial segregation is taking place. There Apartheid is only skin deep. Here Apartheid is soul deep. As long as Israel does not withdraw its troops from the occupied Palestine area, Palestinian problem will not be solved. This is the impression throughout the world. But here Tamils have been fighting for the land where they have been living. But there Palestinians are fighting for a land which they had not got. Therefore, I would request this Government to take effective steps. Effective steps means not showing some concern and condemnation. You give an ultimatum and say that diplomatic relations will be snapped if you want the love and affection and attachment and commitment of fifty million Tamils in future. Otherwise, if you want the friendship of Sinhalese, you need not act, let them die. Let the whole race be liquidated. But even then they will not submit. They will not surrender. (*Time bell rings*).

Therefore, Madam, I think the Government of India has bungled like anything on the Sri Lankan question. Let them realise their blunders and erase their record or opinion of betrayal against the Tamils.

SHRI RAOOF VALILULLAH (Gujarat): Madam Deputy Chairman, a nation's foreign policy is reflected by the cultural heritage of the country, its geo-physical situation, and above all, it is a mirror reflecting the very aspirations of the people. India's foreign policy of peaceful co-existence and non-alignment has been over the years reflecting the composite culture of our country and the aspirations of the Indian people. The major thrust of our foreign policy has been the betterment of our relations with our neighbours and the recent developments in the Indian sub-Continent deserve our immediate attention I would, therefore, at the very outset, like to focus attention on the $ 4.2 billion economic and military aid to Pakistan by the American Administration because it has a direct bearing on the security of this country.

Madam, the world has seen the results of the ill-advised programmes of American Aids to Pakistan from 1954 to 1965 which proved disastrous and resulted into a kind of growth of anti-Americanism in this country.

Madam, history clearly underlines the need for a reappraisal of the American policy of once again providing India-focussed military assistance to Pakistan. By aligning itself with Pakistan in its regional rivalries with India and Afghanistan, the

U.S. has directly opened the way for the Soviet penetration in Afghanistan. It was American military hardware that emboldened Pakistan to initiate the tragic chain of events that resulted in Indo-Pak conficit in 1965. Does the U.S. realise that by providing military aid to Pakistan, it is indirectly accelerating the Indo-Pakistan arms race and strengthening the pro-nuclear lobby in this country? As we are all aware, both India and Pakistan are so far advanced in their efforts to develop nuclear option that American policies to thwart these efforts can do no good. In fact, whereas Pakistan proclaims that it has the nuclear capability and that it possesses the nuclear bomb, the U.S. President, for the last three years, has *been reiterating that Pakistan does not* possess the bomb. It is not surprising, therefore, that at the time of Mr. Gorbachev's visit to New Delhi, the U.S. Administration provoked unprecedented anti-American bitterness in India by announcing plans to provide Pakistan with an airborne early warning system. Therefore, our efforts should be to impress upon the U.S. Administration to abandon or significantly modify this misconceived plan of giving arms to Pakistan. We must also impress upon the American people that there will be no option left to India but to shift from the pursuit of close Indo-American ties to close military cooperation with the USSR. By providing F-16s, heavy tanks, Howitzers and Harpoon missiles intended for use on the Indian border, the U. S. has fanned Indo-Pakistan tensions and strengthened Indian nuclear advocates like the ones we had listened to *in this House* and in the other House, to go in for a nuclear bomb, and it will, at the same time, leave Pakistan free to develop its nuclear options. It is significant that an amendment was moved in the Senate's Foreign Relations Committee by Senator Byrd that any offer to sell early warning aircraft to Pakistan should also be extended to India too until U.S. President certifies that India has provided sufficient assurance that plutonium separated from spent fuel will not be used for nuclear explosion programmes. I would like to draw the attention of the Government that surprisingly this has brought the sale of the super-computer to India into the nuclear non-proliferation debate. The amendment proposed that the super-computer should not be allowed to be sold to India until it offers to resume unconditionally its dialogue with Pakistan to improve bilateral relations with that country. India wants one of the latest models of super-computers and the U.S. would like India to accept a less powerful machine. The assurances by Pakistan to U.S.A. are also not reliable. Even though the President of Pakistan admits that they have acquired nuclear weapons capability, the U.S. President goes on certifying that Pakistan does not possesss the bomb. Therefore, our diplomacy with the U.S.A. must carry with it all aspects of the issue that U.S.-Pakistan arms agree*ment does not harm the interests of this* country.

Madam, the strategy that India need to evolve in regard to its immediate neighbours is also imporant and urgent. Firstly, while the embargo on Jaffna continues, a new military offensive has been launched by the Government of Sri Lanka, thousands of Tamils have died, the ethnic conflict is being resolved in killings and bombings rather than at the negotiating table.

The same holds good for Bangladesh. About 25,000 Buddhist Chakma refugees from that country who were supposed to have gone back on the 15th of January have not done so. The number of refugees has now increased to nearly 50,000. The repatriation of Bangladesh refugees, now in India, must be stressed in a bid to resolve the bilateral issue.

Thirdly, only a few days ago, the Nepalese Government ordered all foreigners working in the country including Indian citizens to apply for work permits. The order is effective from the 14th of this month. Thousands of Indians have been directly affected. We must see that the special relationship with India which has existed since the 1950 Indo-Nepal treaty is not affected, is not changed. Nepal's zone of peace proposal is also seen, as my hon. colleague put it, as a dilution of this special relationship with India. Attention ha

[Shri Raoof Vallallah]

also been drawn to the Nepalese arms supply to the GNLF. Therefore, I urge the Government to be more vigilant on the borders. (*Time bell rings*).

On the other hand, China's hardening of its stand on the Sino-Indian border question despite continuing talks between the two countries to resolve it has also put considerable pressure on India. China's intrusion into the Sumdurong Chu valley and China's hostile intentions made the new Defence Minister, Shri K. C. Pant, to airdash to Beijing. Therefore, the question is still far from being resolved and continues to be a sore point in the Sino-Indian relationship. Therefore, India's claim to regional leadership, particularly, amongst the SAARC countries, should not be allowed to erode and India must reassure these smaller neighbours that it will play an important role in their economic development. Madam, India deserves to be con-

6.00 P.M. gratulated on strengthening the non-alignment movemet and it is in this context that I had submitted a note to the hon. Minister for External Affairs that India should take a lead in the formation of a NAM bank and this bank could usher in a new era for the third world countries.

Madam, since the External Affairs Minister and the Ministry are also in charge of the Haj pilgrimage, I would like to make a few observations on the Haj pilgrimage which takes place every year. I am thankful to the Minister for External Affairs for he was present in Bombay only day before yesterday and he saw for himself the Baitul Hujjaj, the Haj house, which has been constructed by the Haj Committee at a cost of Rs. 6 crores, without taking a single pie from the Government of India. Madam, we have been pleading that the Haj quota should increase. This year 24000 Hajis are intending to go for Haj pilgrimage to Saudi Arabia 23000 with foreign exchange and one thousand without foreign exchange and nearly 5000 applicants have been rejected. I urge the Minister and the Government of India to raise this quota of Hajis so that nevt year when it is quite likely that the Haj pilgrimage by sea may be discontinued, the remaining extra quota could be utilized by air.

Madam, a very important point which was taken up by several MPs and the members of the Haj Committee was the question of subsidy. The hon. Prime Minister had promised that since the pilgrimage by sea was likely to be discontinued, we would see to it that the subsidy which was granted to sea pilgrims may also be given to the pilgrims going by air. And this I reiterate and I feel that the hon. Minister for External Affairs must take a note of it and take an early decision in this matter to save the poor pilgrims who have to pay a very huge fare on travelling by air.

Madam, with this I commend the hon. Minister for External Affairs for having taken such a lot of pains and exercise on the issue of the Haj pilgrimage and I also request the hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs to convey our feelings to the External Affairs Minister.

श्री मीर्जा इर्शादबेग (गुजरात) : महोदया, हज और जो कुछ दूसरी बातें वलीउल्लाह साहब ने बताई हैं मैं सम्पूर्ण रूप से उन सबका समर्थन करता हूं और आपके माध्यम से मंत्री जी से कहूंगा कि इस बात की ओर खास ध्यान दे करके इनको सहूलियतें देने की सम्पूर्ण कोशिश सरकार करे।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Bir Bhadra Pratap Singh. (*Interruptions*). Yes, Mr. Matto, you are going to speak after him.

I will request the Members to take ten minutes thereafter because otherwise the Minister won't get much time. So, please take ten minutes and not more than that.

SHRI BIR BHADRA PRATAP SINGH (Uttar Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, due to paucity of time I would like to speak only about three problems of India's foreign policy. The first question which I want to address to the House is whether India should make an atom bomb vis-a-vis Pakistan's. My second submission would be, what should be India's approach to Sri Lankan problem in view of the American base in Diego Garcia? And my third question would be, how we should

tackle our Chinese problem. There are two core principles that India's foreign policy has always had. One is that we followed an anti-imperialist policy before Independence and after Independence. The second is that we have pursued a policy of peace in the world in general and in the sub-continent in particular. Now one thing about imperialism has become very significant--territorial imperialism has disappeared from the world but it has given shape to monopoly capitalism which is another form of imperialism but it is proving more dangerous than the territorial imperialism. Therefore India, in view of the present situation, has to look very cautiously at monopoly capitalism and the biggest monopoly power in the world--i.e. the United States of America.

With that problem is linked the US base at Diego Garcia. Why? Why have they shifted from their land to our neighbourhood and established a base in Diego Garcia? Not only that, they have armed Diego Garcia with all nuclear weapons. They have declared very recently that Diego Garcia is a base for Stars War. If their love for humanity was so much, if their love for peace was so much, then why did they choose Diego Garcia alone as a base for Stars War, which is just in the Indian Ocean on the threshold of our own territory and by the side of Sri Lanka? I just heard from the lips of one of my learned friend from the other side that if we are not able to do this, that or that-- it has always remained this, that or that, without specifically suggesting what the Government of India should do--the situation would be worse than that of Punjab. This is what the imperialists want. This is what the forces who want to destabilise peace in this sub-continent want. Should we fall into this trap? Or should we resist falling into that trap and committing that folly? Should we give up our anti-imperialist policy? Should we allow peace in this region to be disturbed? Should we allow this region to become a threatre of world war? Should we allow this region to become a theatre of nuclear war? Or should we resist it? Where lies the wisdom? Who is not for our Tamilian brothers who are being massacred, killed and butchered? But what should be the line of approach exactly? They want that India should be destabilised; there should be repercussions of killings of Tamils in Tamil Nadu and Tamil Nadu may become a Punjab, or it should become worse than Punjab. Should we fall in that trap? That is the basic question to all those who say this without suggesting what the Government of India should do exactly. Waging war on Sri Lanka will not solve the problem, I think. It is against all the canons of peace that we want to establish in the world. When Mr. Reagan declared that Diego Garcia shall be a base for Stars War, Mr. Gorbachev had declared, "we shall be following a programme of Stars Peace in the world". You very well remember his policy of unilateral cessation of all nuclear explosions for one year. Another declaration of Mr. Gorbachev was that medium range missiles and small range missiles shall be dismantled, whereas our friends are advocating that we should attack Sri Lanka, wage a war against Sri Lanka. I thing it will be a childish solution.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: You tell the solution. I have told the solution. Now you tell your solution

SHRI BIR BHADRA PRATAP SINGH: If this is not the solution, then we are taking all possible measures. Just to avoid what the imperialts want in this region, we have put in all kinds of pressure on them; we have put pressure and also used persuasion.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: You want to pose to the world as a crusader of peace on the alter of the Tamils. Rajiv Gandhi wants to pose himself as a crusader of peace... (*Interruptions*)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, please.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: They want peace on the graveyard of the Tamils.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down ...(*Interruptions*)... This is not good

SHRI BIR BHADRA PRATAP SINGH: Do you think sentiments can provide any solution to your problem?

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: If a member of your family is butchered, you will realize. Otherwise you will not realize. Tamils are not at all members of your family. That is why you are not bothered.

... (*Interruptions*) ...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is not correct. Please sit down. No noise, please. Mr. Gopalsamy, nobody interrupted you when you were speaking. Now let others speak.

SHRI BIR BHADRA PRATAP SINGH: Madam, we want that there should be peace in the world. If there is peace in the world, this monopoly capitalism is bound to crack itself. What is the result of the American policy? ..(*Interruptions*)..Kindly examine some of the arguments that I am advancing to test what the imperialists want in this region.

Pakistan has gone nuclear and has produced the atomic bomb. Last year I met Professor Abdus Salaam. He is a physicist of international fame and he has left Pakistan and settled down in Italy because he did not want that Pakistan should produce a nuclear bomb. I met him last year when he was here in India. He met our Prime Minister also. Who has advised Pakistan to produce the nuclear bomb? Could not that step be an instigation by the imperialist powers so that this region should become the hot bed of armaments and arms production? After all, who has compelled us to buy eleven engines from America? The Americans' arming Pakistan to the hilt has compelled us to purchase eleven engines for our LCA from America. This is how the imperialists gain both ways. When they instigate one country against the other, then the other country falls in the trap. Therefore, any suggestion made in this House that we should give up our 40 years' time-tested policy of not to produce a nuclear bomb should not be considered. It is a very dangerous solution. I tell you, Madam, if Pakistan produces the atom bomb and if India falls in this trap and gives up its policy which it followed up till now, I think it will not provide any solution to the problem, rather there wil be an armed conflict and an atmosphere of war and the attempt to mention of peace in this region will disappear and, then, all the foreign policy which we have pursued so far—the policy of peace and the policy of anti-imperialism—will collapse. This is what exactly the imperialists want.

But the whole misfortune is about our China policy. Some-body speaking here doubted the sincerety of our Soviet friends. I am very sorry for that. There are no better friends than the Soviets to us. Time has proved that and it was proved even at the time of the Chinese attack. Who put pressure on the Chinese to withdraw at the time of the Chinese war? It was the Soviets. And the Soviets were not friends to us only. When China attacked Vietnam, it was a choice between brother and friend. The Soviets stood with Vietnam against the Chinese and that is why, all the might of China could not humble a small country like Vietnam. So, it is a preposterous suggestion that we should doubt our best friends, that we should not trust them because they are liable to deceive us when there is a conflict between brother and friend and that the Soviets will not stand by their friends. I am quoting a few examples. But the whole misfortune is this, that the Chinese who were calling the Soviets revisionists, unfortunately chose the biggest imperialist, capitalist power as their collaborator. They joined hands with the United States of America in preference to the Soviets. That is the misfortune. That is the second biggest country in the world, and we thought that they would strengthen the forces of socialism in the world. Unfortunately, they have paid more attention to wards America, joined hands with America. Even they called the Soviets "revisionists". That was the misfortune.

What is our stand with the Chinese? Who recognised China? India and England. Have Americans till today recognised the Chinese suzerainty on Tibet? No. Yet, they are their best friends. We recognised them. They said to us, "Bhai,

bhai." But they attacked us in 1962. Yet, in the United Nations Organisation when a resolution was tabled to admit them as a member, it was India which supported first. This was our intention. They being a socialist country, they being our neighbours, we thought that they are our brothers.

But it will be mad to suggest that India must open all fronts at the same time, must fight on the western border, must fight with Sri Lanka must fight with China. I don't think any sagacity lies in such suggestions. Let us think coolly, quietly, calmly whether we should open fronts on all sides. If the relationship with China cn be normalised .... *(Time bell rings)*.

Madam, I am on the last leg of my argument.

If the relationship with China can be normalised, let us make efforts. Chinese must have realised that they have committed an ideological mistake in aligning with the biggest monopoly power in the world, namely, the USA. Chinese must have realised that they have wrongly drifted from the Soviets.

I think Mr. Gorbachov is wise enough. He is the wisest leader in the world today. I must pay my compliments to him. At every step his move is the wisest move. If he is able to maintain peace in the world, to which India must aid in every respect, the capitalism is bound to fall under its own pressures, inevitably under its own, weight.

That is why at every stage I have praise for his speech.

Now, there is a base in Diego Garcia. They have declared Diego Garcia as a base for star wars. Let us not fall in that temtation. I only want to give a word of caution, give a word of wisdom to Indian politicians who are evaluating our foreign policy. Let us not give up our policy of peace and anti-imperialism under the leadership of our able External Affairs Minister.

With this, I will give only one definition. When I started my studies on external affairs, I was taught that a foreign policy of a country is externalisation of the internal conditions of that country. If India's foreign policy has fulfilled that task, if India's foreign policy has stood with that policy declaration, the test that the internal authorities have given that it can only be the country's internal policy externalisation which is truly found in its foreign policy, namely the two, peace and anti-imperialist stand, I think, we have succeeded and we have succeeded well in our foreign policy.

With these words, I support.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: Madam, it is past 6-20. May I draw your attention to this?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: My attention has already been drawn.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: Then, why don't you adjourn today? We can hear the reply tomorrow morning. We want to listen to Mr. Tiwari. Why can't it be so? The Minister is here. We can request him.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Minister is here and he is ready to sit also. There are only two or three Members who have yet to speak. Then he will reply.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: That is all right Normally we are expected to sit till 6. It is all right if others speak, but....

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Members want to speak more also, and do not want to sit This is not correct. If you want to speak for some more time, then you should be prepared to sit a little longer.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: Our session is not concluding today. We want to hear the Minister.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This is a very important subject and you only raised the discussion. So, let at least two or three Members take part. Then the Minister will reply.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: I will request the Minister. Let him reply tomorrow morning.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: it is not necessary.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: Why it is not necessary? We are requesting through you the Minister.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is ready with the reply.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: We are requesting the Minister through you that we want to listen to him. Tomorrow there is a call Attention and after that he can reply.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI M. M. JACOB): Mr. Chatterjee, already a Member has withdrawn from the Speakers' list I think there are only two or one on the list.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: It is already nearly 6.30. It is much better if we take it up tomorrow morning before the Call Attention and then we can take up the Call Attention. There is no other item.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is all right: Mr. Matto.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: Madam, why are you not listening?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It must not be expected that whatever you say, I must agree I have heard your point of view.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: Madam Deputy Chairman, please hear me. Only the other day the Chairman was here. We drew his attention and he agreed to adjourn the House. So, I am drawing your attention to that fact.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Why are you insisting so much?

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: It is not a question of insisting. I am requesting the Minister.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: I hope the hon. Member may not insist upon this. Please cooperate.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: I am in a cooperative mood. I want to hear his speech. Therefore, I want him to speak tomorrow. If he does not want us to hear, it is all right. That is up to him. In that case we are leaving. We wanted to hear the External Affairs Minister. I am sorry we are deprived of that opportunity.

SHRI GHULAM RASOOOL MATTO: Madam Deputy Chairman, I want to congratulate the hon. Minister of External Affairs, because in my career as a Parliamentarian I have seen him sitting here right from the morning till the evening and he has not moved from his seat except for the period just now. And when the last speaker from these benches got up to speak, he also got up. I was a little disappointed thinking that I will not be able to put across my point of view. Why I say this is because I have heard with rapt attention speeches made by hon. Members from both sides and what I am going to speak is the lonely voice from this House, which will be different from the voices spoken.

Madam, all have said and we are agreed on this point that our relations with our neighbours are not good. Different reasons have been assigned and I also feel that it is not for lack of intiative on our part that these relations have not been better. But here I would refer to a Persian proverb:

دیگر زمانہ با تو نسازد
تو با زمانہ بساز

Its translation is: "If the circumstances do not go according to what you want, let you be converted to the circumstances. So, my point is that if we have not been able during the last few years by our foreign policy to make our neighbours and our friends feel convinced about our bonafide intentions towards them. What should we do? To my mind the only alternative available for us is to make 1987 a year of Peace Offensive on our part. We must start an offensive for peace with our neighbours.

Let us start with China. Madam, in 1985 I was in China and honestly felt that although we have tried our level best it is in our interest to have better relations with China; today also I say that we must start our Peace Offensive beginning with China. How do we go about it? We have a problem with China and that is with regard to boundary dispute. This may or may not be liked by many of us but mine is a solitary voice. I feel that we should be a little elastic and in that what should we do? We have drawn the McMahon line.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: We have not drawn.

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO: Kindly bear with me. But the McMahon line has been drawn. To my knowledge an agreement with regard to this line was only initialled and formal Agreement was not signed between us and China. If I am wrong, the Minister can correct me.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: At that time there was no China bordering. Only Tibet was there. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO: Whatever it is, I am telling you it was not rendered into a Boundary Treaty between us and whosoever was the master of China borders with us at that time. The McMahon line as such was not clear in our minds also. Let us forget about it. Let us take a fresh look at it and try to solve this issue. I am not going by the cry made here that we will not leave an inch our territory and we shall not do that. If we have to arrive at an understanding with China, we have to settle with them the border dispute... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: Why don't they do like that?

SHRI GHULAM RASOOL MATTO: Let us settle the border dispute in a spirit of give and take and understanding. As I said earlier, mine is the solitary voice and this I believe is the voice of reason.. (*Interruptions*). Madam, my friend, Mr. Satyanarayan Reddy was also with me when we went to the Free Trade Zone of Shenzen in China. To my mind, it appears that we have lot of trade scope and opportunty there. I read only two days back in the newspapers that FICCI is sending a delegation there to find out ways and means of starting Industries in that zone. But on our own, I can feel that we have a tremendous opportunity in that zone not only in the private sector but also in the public sector like BHEL and HMT. So we should start with the same objective with regard to other neighbours also.

Regarding Pakistan, of course, they have given us lot of troubles. But we must make our policy clear to them so far as the question of Jammu and Kashmir is concerned. It has been settled and Jammu & Kashmir *is a part of India. Now the only* issue that remains is the evacuation of that part of Kashmir which is under their occupation. With the assertion of this point of view by us, the next thing that we should do is to tell Pakistan that we want to have friendly relations with you come on; what have you to say about it? We must make our position with regard to Pakistan very clear. Some hon. friends have said that Afghanistan and Kashmir questions are put on the same plank by them. All that is there and when we are sure about our own position, let us make it clear to them. We should also tell them that let no terrorists be trained there or sent over here and what is your opinion? Now we have made a 'Peace Offer.' They have made a 'no war pact' offer. Let us sit down together, examine and find out what are the good points in their viewpoint and what are the good points in our viewpoint and come to a settlement.

With regard to Sri Lanka, we have to make our position very clear. There is no doubt that we have, so far, not been able to impress upon them the urgency and need of a solution. Had it been the case, the massacre would not have taken place as has taken place last week. So far as we are concerned, we are not going to leave our Tamil brothers there without any help and succour. But we have to tell Sri Lanka finally and firmly to come to a settlement with them and if there is no settlement, then we shall think on our own. We should convert 1987 into a year of peace offensive. This is my point of

[Shri Ghulam Rasool Matto]

view with regard to Sri Lanka. The same applies to Bangladesh. The same applies to Nepal that we have to sit with them and we have to tell them as to what are the points of difference and try to solve those problems. It is not that we should stop with the seventh round of talks with China. It should be a continuous effort till a solution is found. Our policy of non-alignment has stood the test of time. We must remember that great man, Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru who initiated this policy and who said from this House to the entire world that this is the only policy by which the world can survive. There is no other way out and there is no other policy which has stood the test of time and we must not deviate from the policy of non-alignment. But here I have a little suspicion that perhaps because of our actions, I do not know, our intentions were not bad but because of our actions, we have not been able to tell the world that while Russia is our friend and has stood us in good stead in times of need—in fact we in Kashmir, owe our existence to Russia—we have also to understand and say that when in Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru's time, our relations with Western countries and more particularly with America were not so bad, why are they a little bad now. There may be a reason of their supporting Pakistan. There must be something more. But we must also try to improve our relations with America on the fundamental point and tell them that the fundamental principle of non-alignment will not be given up by us at any cost but still we can be good friend. I do not understand whether it is a coincidence or not. Whatever it is, four days back, we read in the newspaper that a few senators had come in between and put their foot down and America was thinking of not giving AWACS and 4.2 billion aid to Pakistan. Our Minister of State for Foreign Affairs went there. What happened? The very moment he left the shores of America, America announced this deal with Pakistan. Was it the failure of our diplomacy or was it that they wanted to befool us, I cannot say. But I feel such a strategy has to be adopted that the entire world must know that we are equi-distant with the two super powers and a perfect non-alignment policy has to be there. Now, Madam, I have something to tell to the hon. Minister with regard to Haj. He has been good enough and yesterday I have heard on the radio that he has visited the Haj House in Bombay. Now, the hon. Prime Minister has announced in public in Jammu and Kashmir that the pilgrims from Kashmir will be directly flown from Srinagar to Mecca and they will not have to come to Delhi first and then from Delhi, they will have to go there separately and also I would request the hon. Minister to reconsider that the subsidy of Rs. 1 crore that was announced by the Prime Minister two years back has not still been given to Haj Committee. And, Madam, it must be given and it must also be categorically stated—there was also an assurance by the honourable Prime Minister to this effect—as envisaged in the Budget on foreign exchange released to tourists and this tax should not be there in the case of foreign exchange for Haj. The subsidy point also should be considered. I agree with my friend, Shri Raoof Valiullah that the Hazis quota should be increased. These things should be done.

The other point that I wanted to make is that in the Arab world, we have stood by them through thick and thin and we have stood by the Palestinians and here I agree with my friend, Shri Satyanarayan Reddy, that they should also reciprocate and give us their support in matters which concern us and us only and which do not directly affect them and no harm is done to them as a result of these policies.

Madam, these are the observations that I wanted to make. I do not want to take much time because I have already said that my refrain would be quite different from that of others. But I reiterate my request to the honourable Minister that he should announce here and now that the year 1987 will be a Peace Offensive year with regard to our neighbours. Thank you, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, Thakur Jagatpal Singh.

ठाकुर जगत पाल सिंह (मध्य प्रदेश) : आदरणीय उपसभापति महोदया, मैं इससे पहले कि कुछ कहूं सबसे पहले मैं अपने उस महान नेता पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू को बधाई देना चाहता हूं जिन्होंने हमारी विदेश नीति की नींव रखी। उस नीति के जो नतीजे हैं वे आज हमारे सामने हैं। इसके साथ साथ श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी जी को भी बधाई देना चाहता हूं जिन्होंने उस नीति पर चलकर इस देश को तमाम खतरों से बचाया। महोदया, आज राजीव गांधी जी भी उसी नीति पर चलकर देश को बचाते हुए चले जा रहे हैं। मैं कुछ मिसालें देना चाहता हूं। सैकेंड वर्ल्ड वार के बाद बड़ी ताकतों ने यह सोच लिया था कि हम आपस में नहीं लड़ेंगे, लोकलाइज वार होना चाहिए। उन्होंने एक मुल्क के दो मुल्क कराये, वियतनाम एक के दो हुए, कोरिया एक के दो हुए, जर्मनी एक के दो हुए, हिन्दुस्तान एक से दो हिस्सों में बंटा, पाकिस्तान के भी दो हिस्से हुए। उन्होंने छोटे छोटे मुल्कों में लड़ाइयां शुरू कराईं इसलिये कि उनके हथियार बिकते रहें और वे खतरे से बचते रहें। हमारी जो नानअएलाइंड की नीति है उसके जो नतीजे आये हैं वह मैं आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूं। महोदया, कोई भी फल देखने से आप यह पहचान सकते हैं कि कौन सा पेड़ है उसी तरह से किसी भी नीति के जो नतीजे आते हैं उनसे आप पहचान सकते हैं कि वह जो नीति है वह अच्छी है या बुरी है। हमारा देश आजाद हुआ। आजादी के बाद हमने यह तय किया था कि हम अपने देश में सामाजिक क्रान्ति करेंगे, गरीबी मिटायेंगे और देश में प्रजातंत्र कायम करेंगे। लेकिन उन लोगों ने जिन्होंने हमें आजाद किया और वे जो मुल्कों में कालानी बनाना चाहते थे उन्होंने यह नहीं कहा तब हमने क्या किया? उस वक्त पंडित नेहरू ने दूरदर्शिता से काम लिया। उस वक्त हालात इससे ज्यादा खराब थे। कोई भी नीति जब किसी मुल्क की बनती है तो उस मुल्क की जागरफीकल कंडीशंस, उस मुल्क का टेक्निकल नौ-हाऊ, उस मुल्क की मैन-पावर, उस मुल्क की ट्रेडीशंस एंड कन्वेंशंस देखी जाती है। हमारा मुल्क जब आजाद हुआ उस वक्त हमारी जागरफीकल कंडीशंस क्या थीं। एक तरफ चाइना था और दूसरी तरफ पाकिस्तान। चाइना एक गुट में था, कम्युनिस्ट ब्लाक में था और पाकिस्तान राइटिस्ट ब्लाक में था। अगर हम उस वक्त अपने उन दोस्तों, अपने उन नेताओं की बात जो उस वक्त देश में थे, जो कह रहे थे कि नेहरू जी की नीति गलत है, मान लेते और अगर हम उस गुट में चले गये होते तो हिन्दुस्तान का क्या होता? अगर हम उनकी बात मान लेते तो इस वक्त हम राइटिस्ट गुट में होते और हिन्दुस्तान, पाकिस्तान तथा अमेरिका एक साथ होते और चाइना के साथ वार चलता रहता और हिन्दुस्तान बैटलफील्ड होता। लेकिन हमने जब हमारा पाकिस्तान के साथ वार हुआ तो हमने मुस्लिम कन्ट्रीज अरब कन्ट्रीज से शिप रुकवा दिये और हमने बार्डर पर लड़ाई रोक दी। क्या यह हमारी नीति की सक्सेस नहीं थी? जब चीन के साथ लड़ाई हुई तो हमने बार्डर पर लड़ाई रोक दी और उसके बाद उसके भाई, उसके दोस्तों को हमने उससे अलग कर दिया। क्या यह आपने नहीं देखा? क्या आप चाहते हैं कि हमारा मुल्क लड़ाई में उलझ जाय, हमारा देश एक लड़ाई का मैदान बन जाय; जरा आप देखें कि कोई भी नीति चाहे वह विदेश नीति हो या घरेलू नीति हो दोनों एक दूसरे की पूरक होती हैं। विदेश नीति क्यों बनती है? यह इसलिये बनती है कि हमारे देश का डेवलपमेंट हो, हमारे देश के अंदर गरीबी मिटे, हमारे देश के अंदर खुशहाली आये, देश में प्रजातंत्र कायम रहे। यह विदेश नीति जो हमने बनाई है, जो आज चल रही है इसके चलते देश में कितनी तरक्की हुई? अगर हम उस वक्त लड़ाई में इनवाल्व हो गये होते तो क्या हमारी कोर इंडस्ट्री बन सकती थी, क्या हमारे देश की गरीबी मिट सकती थी, क्या हमारा देश जो आज दुनियां के उन मुल्कों में गिना जा रहा है जो तीसरी शक्ति के रूप में उभर रहा है क्या यह हो सकता था? एक छोटे खतरे

[श्री जगत पाल सिंह]

को अवायड करने के लिए कभी बड़ा खतरा मोल नहीं लिया जाता । सब से अच्छा कमांडर वही होता है जो हर फ्रंट पर लड़ाई नहीं छेड़ता है । आज हमारे ऊपर प्रेशर क्रियेट किये जा रहे हैं । क्यों किये जा रहे हैं ? इसका कारण यह है कि हमारी आर्थिक प्रगति बहुत तेजी से हो रही है उसमें कावट आए, विदेशी ताकतें यह चाहती हैं कि इस आर्थिक प्रगति को रोकें, इसके लिए कोशिश की जा रही है । जो पैसा हमारी प्रोडक्शन साइड में लगता है वह प्रोडक्शन साइड में न लग कर अनप्रोडक्टिव साइड मे लगे ताकि हमारी प्रोडक्शन कम हो जाए । यदि हमारी प्रोडक्शन कम हो जाएगी तो क्योंकि पापुलेशन ज्योमेट्रीकल बढ़ रही है इससे हमारा नेशनल वेल्थ बहुत तेजी से नहीं बढ़ पाएगा और न ही हम अपनी पर केपिटा इनकम बढ़ा पाएंगे । इसलिए हमारे बार्डर पर तनाव की स्थिति पदा की जा रही है । आज पाकिस्तान को आर्म्स दिये जा रहे हैं । यह इसलिए यदि पाकिस्तान को अच्छे अच्छे हथियार मिलेंगे तो हमें भी अपनी डिफेंस के लिए अच्छे अच्छे हथियार खरीदने पड़ेंगे । हम किसी की एक इंच जमीन नहीं लेना चाहते हैं और न हम अपनी जमीन किसी को देना चाहते हैं । लेकिन अगर हमें आर्म्स खरीदने पड़ेंगे, आर्म्स खरीदेंगे तो हमारा जो पैसा प्रोडक्शन में लग रहा है, जो विकास की तरफ पैसा लग रहा है वह नहीं लग सकेगा । इस तरह से हमारा देश गरीब होगा और हमारे देश के अन्दर यदि गरीबी आएगी तो उससे एक खूनी क्रान्ति होगी जिस क्रान्ति में इस मुल्क का क्या होगा यह तो आने वाला इतिहास ही लिख सकता है । मैं आज यही बात कह सकता हूं कि हमारी नीति के नतीजे बहुत अच्छे निकले हैं । मुझे याद है आप क्षमा करेंगे हमारे विरोधी पक्ष के लोगों ने बहुत सी बातें कहीं हैं । मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि उन्हें भी सरकार मिली थी । आदरणीय अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी विदेश मन्त्री थे लेकिन उन्होंने भी इस विदेश नीति में कोई चेंज नहीं किया, एक भी चेंज नहीं किया । जिस वक्त शिमला समझौता हुआ था उस वक्त वे नारे लगा रहे थे कि श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी ने शिमला समझौता गलत किया है । फिर उसी शिमला समझौते पर बात करने के लिए वे पाकिस्तान भी गये । क्या उन्होंने इस विदेश नीति में कोई चेंज किया ? नहीं किया । मैं आपके माध्यम से सरकार को बधाई देना चाहता हूं कि हमारी जो विदेश नीति है वह शान्ति की है, प्यार की है, न्याय की है और हम पूरे मुल्क के अन्दर, पूरे विश्व के अन्दर शान्ति चाहते हैं । हम शान्ति इसलिए चाहते हैं क्योंकि आज दुनियां के मुल्कों में होड़ लगी हुई है । जो अमीर मुल्क हैं वह आपस में गरीब मुल्कों को लड़ाना चाहते हैं । इसका कारण यह है कि यदि गरीब मुल्कों में लड़ाई होती है तो इन देशों की गरीबी कभी नहीं मिट सकती हैं क्योंकि यह अपने आप को लड़ाई में ही इनवाल्व रखेंगे । मैं आपको बधाई देना चाहता हूं । अब समय भी काफी हो चुका है और करीब करीब सभी बातें कही जा चुकी हैं । मैं अंत में एक बात कह कर अपनी बात समाप्त करूंगा । सब से अच्छा कमांडर वही होता है जो हर फ्रंट पर लड़ाई नहीं छेड़ता । आज हमारे चारों तरफ फ्रंट खुलते जा रहे हैं जिससे हम उलझ जाएं । मेरा इशारा है अपने माननीय विरोधी दलों के सदस्यों की ओर—मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि छोटे खतरे को अवायड करने के लिए कभी बड़ा खतरा मोल नहीं लिया जाता । हमने पिछले चालीस सालों में मुल्कों को लड़ने से रोका है । इसलिए आज हम लड़ाई की तरफ बिलकुल न सोचें और नेगोशियेशन टेबल पर बैठ कर हर तरह का प्रेशर क्रियेट कर के उन चीजों से निपटा जाए लेकिन छोटे खतरे को अवायड करने के लिए बड़ा खतरा मोल न लें । जितना हमारे साथियों के दिल में तमिल भाइयों के लिए दर्द है उससे ज्यादा हमारे दिल में है । लेकिन हम नहीं चाहते हैं कि छोटे खतरे के लिए बड़ा खतरा मोल ले कर हम इस देश को बरबाद कर दें लड़ाई में झोंक दें । अगर आज लड़ाई हो गयी दुनियां

की वह ताकतें चाहती हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान बरबाद हो जाए उनको ऐसा मौका न दें जितना ढिलाई से काम कर सकते है करे । आपने जो समय दिया इसके लिए मैं आपका आभारी हूं ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Miniser.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI): Madam Deputy Chairman, as I rise to seek you permission to reply to this great debate on the working of the External Affairs Ministry, I am a little conscious of the fact that this is going to be my first submission before this august House after taking over a new and more responsible assignmet in the strvice of this House. Therefore, I consider it my bounden duty, Madam, first to bow reverentially before the unique constitutional parliamentary majesty of this House. I bow before you, Madam, as reprtsenting the Chair of this majestic House, as a symbol of its dignity and authority.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I respect your feelings.

SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI: I bow before each and every hon. Member of this House representing, singly and individually, the magnificent constitutional edifice of this House as its vibrant and living constitutional entity. May I assure you, Madam, that I will try my best to be at the service of this House and at your service at all time except when I have been called upon because I was late by three minutes yesterto discharge my responsibilities towards this House as the External Affairs Minister in the course of implementation of our foreign policy.

May I also, at this point of time, apologise to the hon. House, to the hon. Members and also to my dear friend, Mr. Gurupadaswamy, who is not present here because I was late by three minutes yesterday when the debate bgan? I tried my best. I rather ran from the other House. We had the Question Hour there. Even at one minute to twelve, there was a question to be answered. I had to be there. As soon as the clock struck 12 and the House took up the next item on the agenda, I ran from the other House. I could not be here on time and the debate started. It is my duty to express my regrets. It was never my intention to be late. I hope the House will accept my profound regret.

Madam, I am very very grateful to the hon. Members who have participated in this most illuminating debate in the highest traditions of this august House. I am greateful to my old friend and colleague, Mr. Gurupadaswamy, for having elaborated at length the basic principles of our foreign policy and its historic evolution. As he was initiating the debate, he quoted Palmerston and even Machiavelli. When I was listening to him, I was reminded of Kautilya. Of course, all diplomacy in modern times is supposed to have emanated from Machiavelli. But we have come a long way from Machiavelli. As he has quoted Machiavelli, I would also like to quote from Chanakaya Niti i.e. Kautilya's Arth Shastra wherein we find how centuries ago, thousands of years ago, Chankya of India wrote what should be done by kings and diplomats and what should be done in the field of foreign policy. Let us take sample:

"शत्रु प्रदेश में अपने स्वामी का संदेश लेकर जाना, शत्रु राज्य का संदेश लाने के लिए जाना, संधि भाव को बनाए रखना, समय आने पर अपने पराक्रम को दिखाना अधिक से अधिक मित्र बनाना, शत्रु के कुछ पक्ष के मित्रों को फोड़ देना, शत्रु के मित्रों को उससे विमुख कर देना।"

These principles of diplomacy were adumbrated in Kautiliya Niti, not now but long long ago, centuries and centuries before Machiavelli was born and all the axioms of modern diplomacy were written. Sometimes, even if you want to speak about conflicts and confrontation, do it in a diplomatic way. That is modern diplomacy. This is not so from our times, but from our age-old tradition, even as reflected in Chanakya Niti.

As my friend and colleague, Shri Gurupadaswamy, has quoted Palmerston, I would like to quote Pandit Jawaharlal

[Shri Narayan Dutt Tiwari].

Nehru when he was addressing the Constituent Assembly. He said very clearly enunciating a principle regarding foreign policy matters on December 4, 1947 that "whatever we may lay down, the art of conducting the foreign affairs of a country lies in finding out what is most advantageous to the country."

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra): Quite correct.

SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI: So, the basics of our foreign policy are well-rooted in the experiences gained through centuries of diplomatic endeavour, of diplomatic parlance, of diplomatic nuances that we have inherited from the world history, from the cut and thrust of diplomatic movement round the world that we have seen leading to so many wars. The policy of non-alignment itself, Madam, has vowed out of our experiences through history. What is non-alignment? One of my friends said that non-alignment is not an objective. May I humbly submit before this august House, may I quote what Jawaharlal Nehru said, when he was the Vice-President of the Interim Government? There was a coalition Government with the Muslim League in the British days. The British Governor-General was here. But even then on September 7, 1946, in his broadcast to the nation, Jawaharlal Nehru said, "We propose as far as possible to keep away from the power politics of groups aligned against one another which had led in the past to world wars and which may again bring disasters on a vast scale. What was he referring to, Madam? He was referring to the First World War when we had the German--Austrian combine on the one hand. We know how the War was declared when Archduke Ferdinand was assassinated in Serajevo in Yugoslavia. The First World War was started because of these powers, the Austro-Hungarian empire and the German empire coming together as Axis and just because of this assassination of Archduke Ferdinand. And then you see how one sentence wrongly uttered leads to world wars. What did Wilhelm Kaiser say in 1914? He Said, 'I regard my Treaty with England as a scrap of paper"—just one sentence that it is a scrap of paper; it is not a treaty, it is a scrap of paper. And England and France took umbrage to it as to why he said that. "It is a treaty, it is a sacrosanct document, and you are considering it a scrap of paper." And we saw the First World War. Then you see how the Czarist Russia, the Austro-Hungarian empire, the Kaiserite empire, the German empire combined on the one hand, and the other non-Axis powers combined on the other and this is how the First World War started. Then again in the Second World War, we had the Axis powers—Germany, Italy and Japan. This was the Axis, this was the alignment. This was a power block which put us through the horrors of the Second World War, and the Allied forces versus the Axis forces. So, it was not only in the present content but it was in the historical context that we found that alignment with power blocs has led to world wars. And, therefore our policy of non-alignment is a positive ojective so that the world can be saved for peace. Therefore, Madam, this august House has blessed this policy of non-alignment, the objective of non-alignment time and again whenever the foreign policy has been discussed under the sacred portals of this House. this policy had always has more or less the unanimous support of this House. If there has been any complaint, it has been regarding the implementation of it but not otherwise.

So, again, today I am very thankful to the hon. Memers for having more or less unanimously supported the basic objectives of our foreign policy-non-alignment, disarmament, peace and harmony round the world, conflicts being resolved through negotiations and peace, anti-colonialism, anti-apartheid and anti-racism. And wherever in the world the forces of economic imperialism and neo-imperialism prevail our policy stands against them squarely and forcefully. Such are our foreign policy objectives.

I am thankful to Shri P. N. Sukul for his presentatiion. I also compliment him for the role he played in the recent meeting at Geneva in the Human Rights Commission where a unanimous Resolution was

passed depreciating the Human Rights situation in Ceylon, unanimous resolution. And, to achieve this Mr. Sukul, Mr. Veerendra Patil and others made a great contribution. I compliment them and here I would also like to compliment my friends, Shri Valampuri John and Shri Gopalsamy for having made a very forceful presentation of their views. I join them in their great anguish because I think what the editorial of the Hindu has said that the Government must read, the Prime Minister must read the present danger in Sri Lanka as a high priority problem for India in the region...

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Is it a high priority problem or not? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI: Therefore, I am responding to this first. I have mentioned the unanimity in this as our foreign policy objective. I would say that we are very deeply concerned and we are in great anguish. We are rightly exercised about the situation in Sri Lanka. The developments there in recent days are indeed tragic. Hon. Members are aware of the grave concern of the Government of India as expressed by the Official spokesman. We have condemned the new escalation of violence as seen in the aerial attacks on Jaffna which have been taking place day after day and are today in their fifth straight day. Hundreds of innocent civilians have been killed. We have unequivocally condemned this. We are equally concerned about the statement by the Prime Minister Shri Premadasa in Sri Lankan Parliament, foreclosing a political solution and declaring his Government's determination to pursue the military option. Here I would like to refer to the editorial of the Hindu from which my esteemed friend Shri Gopalsamy quoted *ab initio*. What has this editorial which the Hindu has written said? Here I may assure my friend, Mr. Gopalsamy and Mr. Valampuri that this is not a problem of Tamil Nadu. This is a problem with which the whole country is concerned about. There is no doubt about it that it is the problem of India as a whole and we are dealing with it as such.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Go in action and do not say words only. These words will not solve the problem. How many times your predecessors have also expressed this concern? (*Interruptions*). This is not going to solve the problem. You are not here to command me. I am talking to the Minister. Who are you to command me? Mr. Minister, I have got great respect for you. Mr. Minister, you have inherited the burden of blunders committed by Shri Rajiv Gandhi and your predecessors.

SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI: If I may be allowed to continue, I would be more thankful because I listened patiently to the views of Hon. Member when he spoke. Therefore, I would say, let us stand as a nation behind this policy. A policy which has been evolved not as a partisan policy but a policy of consensus and here I mention the Hindu editorial. I have got the Hindu paper of April 25, 1987. What does it say: "They must honestly take stock of the results of 1985-87 policy and come with a serous *modus operandi* for bringing to an end the senseless hostilities while" continuing to rule out any truck with either the Eelam demand or any mad-cap ideas of finding any kind of military solution to the Sri Lankan ethnic conflict. Above all, Indian policy-makers must realise that this nation has a deep strategic and democratic interest in finding a lasting solution to the Sri Lankan crisis."

7.00 P.M.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: You have failed in that. You have not pursued. That is what the Editorial says.

SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI: What I am saying is that we are adhering to the basic principles of negotiations that have been adumbrated in this editorial of Hindu, and we will continue to adhere to it. I would once again take this occasion to call upon the Government of Sri Lanka that whatever Mr. Premadasa might have said, they should come to the negotiation table; let both the sides come to the negotiation table with December 19 proposals as the framework. Let all the blockades of removed. There is no question on that. Let the economic blockade of Jaffna and the peninsula be removed immediately and let both sides negotiate

[Shri Narayan Datt Tiwari]

within the Sri Lankan constitution—as he said—within the established framework.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: And bombing of Jaffna should stop immediately.

SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI: Yes, without that, what can be done? Bombing has to be stopped immediately... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Mr. Minister, Will you yield for a minute. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI MIRZA IRSHADBAIG: He should sit down. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI VALAMPURI JOHN: Who are you? Are you not a dictator? I am not going to sit down... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI MIRZA IRSHADBAIG: But the Minister is replying... (*Interruptions*).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Listen to the Minister. Everybody listen to him. It is your duty to listen to him quietly. But if you go on interrupting... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I requested the Minister to yield for a minute and he has yielded.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You cannot request. Even if the Minister yields, no Member can speak unless the Chair permits. This is the rule.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Then I seek your permission... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI VALAMPURI JOHN: What is the rule? (*Interruptions*). Who is he to say that? He should sit down. (*Interruptions*).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Everybody please sit down. There should not be any noise in the House. Please sit down. You cannot go on with this type of noise. Please sit down now. The Minister will not yield.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: May I make a request because the Minister is yielding?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, please sit down. You had full chance to say whatever you wanted to say. You got enough time. You had a full chance I gave you special chance and you said what you wanted to say. And now you are interrupting. This is not fair.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: : I want a clarification; Minister has yielded.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, he has not. You please sit down and let him continue.

SHRI V GOPALSAMY: Madam, he has yielded.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, he has not.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Because he made a reference to the statement of Mr. Premdasa....

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If you say anything, it will not go on record You are not far. (*Interruptions*) You were given full time. (*Interruptions*). Mr. Gopalsay, you had absolutely no time, but you spoke for 27 minutes. Each and everything said by you was listened to in complete silence. Everybody listened to you. But now you do not want to hear the reply of the hon. Minister. You do not want to listen to him. (*Interruption*).

SHRI V GOPALSAMY: Madam, I am sorry to interrupt. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI RAOOF VALIULLAH: Madam, we want to hear the Minister. (*Interruption*).

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Madam, I only interrupted because the hon. Minister made a reference to the statement of the Prime Minister of Sri Lanka. (*Interruptions*).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right: I will allow you but only on the condition that you will not speak for more

than two minutes and you will not again interrupt. (*Interruptions*). Please listen to me first. When I am standing, yo cannot go on speaking like this. You can now raise your points but afterwards you should not interrupt. Now, when I am permitting you, you are not speaking. (*Interruptions*) It does not matter whether the Minister has yielded or not. You are given one more chance to speak now.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Madam, while the hon. Minister referred to the statement of Mr. Premadasa, he said 'whatever Mr Premdasa might have said'. I say, the statement of Mr. Premadasa is nothing but a slap on the face of India. This is not a statement to be ignored. Therefore, may I know from the hon. Minister whether we have resumed our good offices? Sometime back, you said that you are not going to resume your good offices. Now, I would like to know whether you have resumed your good offices. I would also like to know whether you pressurised the militants in Bangalore, as it has been reported in 'The Hindu', to agree to the proposals to come to the negotiating table. I would like to know whether pressure was exerted on the militants in Bangalore or not. I want a specific answer.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Anything more you want to ask?

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I do not know what he is going to say.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There cannot be a debate between you and the Minister. If you want to ask anything more, you have my permission to ask.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: If you do not permit me, I will not get up. I strictly obey your orders.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am giving you more time to ask anything more you want to ask.

SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI: I did not follow what was Mr. Gopalsamy's question regarding Bangalore.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: It has been reported in 'The Hindu' that in Bangalore, the militants, particularly, the LTTE leaders, were forced by the Government to come to the negotiating table. It was said that otherwise the Sri Lankan Government was threatening that thousands of innocent Tamils will be killed and the Seventh Fleet may enter. They were told that this was the situation and that, therefore, they should come to the negotiating table. This was the pressure exerted on the militants. This has been reported in 'The Hindu'. I would like to know whether it is a fact or not.

SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI: I do not have any such information. Madam, in the field of diplomacy, even offensive statements are taken in the overall context. As Foreign Minister of India, as External Affairs Minister of India, I have also to take into account the statement of President Jayewardene published in the Indian Press today. I have to read the statement of President Jayewardene along with the statement of the Prime Minister of Sri Lanka, Mr. Premadasa yesterday. I would say that in diplomatic parlance, I must interpret the statement made by President Jaye-wardene today declaring himself pro-peace pro-negotiations. President Jayewardene being the Head of the State, it is and it should be the authoritative statement on behalf of the Sri Lankan Government. This is the stand I have to take as Foreign Minister.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Is it a trustworthy statement?

SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI: I would say that if any statement was given yesterday, this has been retracted today and now the latest statement made by President Jayewardene should be deemed by me, as Foreign Minister as Sri Lankan policy I am not binding you but as Foreign Minister I have to say that this statement is more authentic. Therefore, I say that the Government of India urges all parties to the ethnic conflict to exercise maximum restraint. We call on them to create conditions which would enable early resumption of a dialogue for negotiating a political settlement which would meet the legitimate aspirations of the Tamil minority within the framework

[Shri Narayan Datt Tiwari]

of the unity and territorial integrity of Sri Lanka. This is our stand and we will continue to pursue this objective in the coming days. And I may assure you, Madam, and through you the hon. House, that our Prime Minister himself has been devoting hours and hours, everyday even days at length irrespective of the engagements that he might be having, to the solution for this problem. I have been a witness myself. Only day before yesterday, yesterday, three days back, four days back, even some Tamil leaders were invited to come to Delhi and our point of view has been forcefully made clear to them.

I call upon my esteemed leaders of public opinion of all politcal parties in Tamil Nadu, in our country, wherever they might be, let us pool our talent together so that we could show to the world that we are one as regards our objective to bring peace to Sri Lanka and to stop this holocaust, this violence against innocent civilians, which is being brought there.

Madam, there would be many more opportunities to discuss this problem informally. In the near future, Ihope we will have the time to have informal consultations. The Prime Minister himself has said that not all the matters being letted about can be discussed there. These are delicate things and, therefore, we can informally discuss such matters outside the House. It is not necessary that we discuss all details here and I would be very thankful for the cooperation of the hon. Members.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Madam, may I seek one clarification? What was conveyed by our hon. Prime Minister to the President of Sri Lanka over telephone because it has appeared in the press?

SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI: As far as my information goes there was no such talk yesterday or day before yesterday. The talk might have been held earlier. I do not know but there was no such specific talk on telephone with President Jayewardene. (Interruptions) If it is found necessary, of course the Prime Minister can talk to the President. I know, if the initiative is required, it can be done any time.

Madam, Shri Gurupadaswamy had mentioned to the fact that bi-polar system had emerged at the end of the Second World War and that bi-polar system has now become multi-polar and that India has played an increasing role in this process in view of its defensive capability, continental size, population and resources. I agree that now the world scene is more and more becoming multi-polar. Here Mr. Gurupadaswamy mentioned to the fact that India has now emerged as a middle power in the world. We have never used this term. Of course, Mr. Gurupadaswamy, in is assessment if he considers that there are middle powers in the world, he is entiled to this opinion. I may for his information mention here that Nigeria has actually proposed that there should be a concert of middle powers. India has not accepted that we should call ourselves as 'middle powers'. It will be difficult to define 'middle powers' but of course, i they had called a meeting on this that we should have another organisation of concert of middle powers. We have said that it is difficult for countries to proclaim themselves 'middle powers', that we shall be middle powers and what not. The idea is already there. But we do not want ourselves tc be considered in terms of a super power or middle power or medium power or small power. We are there in our own right as a great country with a historic past. We do not want to boast regarding our strength. But we want to play our full part to bring about a peaceful world. And it is just because of this that you find the historic New Delhi Declaration on the anvil. I thing if we go through the New Delhi Declaration between General Secretary Gorbachev and our Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi —and I would call upon the Members who have so beautifully mentioned the various aspects of our foreign policy to go through it—I have myself read this Declaration thrice four times, ten times and every time I read it. I find that this is going to be the testament of human destiny in the coming decades because it brings forth before the world how coexistence can become a reality, how non-violence can be the creed of the world as a societal structure within all countries. I

think this is amalgam of the ideas of Marx and Gandhiji, of all ideologues and leading theorists of the world led by Marx and Gandhi. We find this quintessential dimension of this ideological cohesion reflected in this New Delhi Declaration. And therefore I would say, let us ourselves try to understand the implications of this Declaration and how we are going to translate this Declaration into practice through our foreign policy. That is the challenge.

Here I would like to come to the question as to how we should consider our relations with our neighbours in this context. It is so difficult to discuss our relations with Pakistan in a very short frame of time. You know, Madam, that India is committed to developing cordial relations and good neighbourly relations with Pakistan in accordance with the letter and spirit of the Simla Agreement. We have recently taken a number of initiatives to promote the process of normalisation with Pakistan, including the establishment of a Joint Economic Commission. We have offered a Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation. We have made various proposals to ease problems between the two countries. We have suggested the possibility of reopening the Khokrapar-Manubao railway route. We have proposed non-discriminatory trade relations, exchanging newspapers and periodicals, proposal for non-attack on each other's nuclear installations and the proposal for Secretary level meeting for defusing tensions on the borders. I have listed some of the major proposals that have been made. When President Zia-ul-Haq was recently here to witness the cricket match, then also our Prime Minister offered to him, let the two Sub Commissions that have not met recently, meet; let our economic and trade relations be strengthened. Our Prime Minister also offered that I as a humble servant of the foreign policy of this country could then go to Pakistan for a joint meeting of the Economic Commission. So the offer has been made. Now what we have been seeing in the last few months is that Pakistan has been, as far as their theoretical stance goes, talking about peace nad negotiations, and taking similar stances and postures. But, in practice, we do not find a practical implementation of what they say. Therefore, what we would emphatically suggest to Pakistan is, let these Sub-Commissions meet, let us try to normalize relations within the framework of the Simla Agreement. What is the hurdle? In this context we have again suggested that our Foreign Secretary could visit Pakistan, and we also look forward to the ministerial level meetings for SAARC purposes here, next month. We have convened a meeting of the SAARC Ministerial Council here and during that meeting also we will have the opportunity to informally discuss our bilateral relations. I look forward to meeting His Excellency Mr. Yakub Khan, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan and then we can also discuss, informally and formally, all the bilateral matters. So we are for negotiations with Pakistan on the basis of the Simla Agreement. Let Pakistan come to the negotiating table and discuss all the proposals which are already lying on the table, rather than embark on their current programme of massive acquisition of sophisticated weaponry paid for by aid from USA.

In this context, I must say that Pakistan's nuclear weapons programme is a matter of grave concern to us, since it affects our security environment. We have repeatedly made it clear that acquisition of nuclear weapons by Pakistan is a development which we cannot afford to ignore and which requires us to take all necessary measures for our own national security; I may repeat —requires us to take all necessary measures for our own national security. Our objective is a durable structure of peace in the sub-continent. We feel that fear and mistrust between our two countries must be removed and the resources that we have in each of our countries should be used for the development of our people rather than for the acquisition of arms.

Madam, as regards, China, you are very well aware—and this House knows—that we have had seven rounds of talks regarding our border issue. But while we have been making relevant proposals to China, China has not been so forthcoming in its proposals, with specific detailed, proposals regarding our border. Now we look forward to the eighth round of

SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI: I talks and I may assure this House and all those Members who talked of our negotiations with China, that we are prepared to negotiate with China, we are prepared for holding the eighth round of talks. The Chinese Vice Foreign Minister, Mr. Zhang Zhui Zhung, has recently announced that the eighth round of talks should be held and that they will propose a date for the talks after the summer. Let me assure this House that, as announced by the Vice Foreign Minister, we are awaiting their proposals regarding the date for discussions and we are ready for talks. We hope that China will reciprocate our desire to maintain peace and tranquility along the entire border. In this context, the activities of the Chinese in the Sumdurong Chu Valley have not been helpful, nor can we accept their statements regarding the grant of statehood to Arunachal Pradesh. I may also mention here that the Chinese statement that we are massing our troops in Arunachal Pradesh of that we are conducting military exercises or that we have been nibbling at their borders and that we have also entered into their territories, is wrong. They say that our saying that they have intruded in the Sumdurong Chu valley is wrong. We say that their statement that we are amassing troops, preparing our position is wrong. We also say that they are wrong in their accusations that we are amassing troops, we are preparing ourselves and we have intruded into their territory. That is also wrong. They say that we are wrong. Let us maintain the *status quo* there, and let us talk of peace That is our stand.

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN: By *status quo* are you accepting the helipads there? Let him explain. I am not asking a party question. He has just said that he was accepting the *status quo*.

SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI: Mr. Mahajan, it seems, is a budding Parliamentarian, and I hope he will also prove himself to be a budding diplomat, a diplomat politician. Not everything is said. It is such a delicate matter that I cannot say that we have accepted the helipads.

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN: Sir, you have just said that we have accepted the *status quo* position. That is why I am asking what you mean by *status quo*. It can be misinterpreted that you are accepting the helipads and the construction in the Somdurong valley, I want you to clarify your and our internal position. It is necessary for diplomacy. As a good diplomat you should not accept the *status quo*.

SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI: Yes, as a diplomat I should not say about The *status quo*. But what I mean to say is *status quo* ant. I was going to elaborate. What I am saying is *status quo* ante along the McMahon. Of course we will discuss that round the table, because they are also saying that we are also having helipads. If you say that *status quo* has to remain, we have to accept their helipads. They have also been accusing us that we have intruded into their territory. That means that they accept that also. This does not mean that we accept because they have come out with names. These names have also been published in the 'Indian press'. So, we cannot accept all this, that we have intruded into their territory. I think, yet it not be said that they have occupied our territory. They have also said that we have occupied their territory. So, what I would say is....

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN: Have they or not? It is a simple question. We believe that we have not. But have they or not?

SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI: Yes, they have or not? A very good Mahajan never says what the interest rate was and what was the principal. Sometimes they keep secret.

SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN: It is not a question of secrecy, Sir. I think, Chinese have occupied our territory. You must come out. What is the secrecy?

SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI: I do not want to go into the military aspects of this question. The defence aspect, I leave it to my colleague, the hon. Defence Minister. But what I would say is that as far as our diplomatic part of it is there, I would say that we are prepared for negotiations. We have had seven rounds of talks, and now we are prepared for the eighth round of talks.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Have they intruded or not?

SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI: I may also take note here of the discussion that Mr. Namboodripad held with Mr. Deng Xiao Ping, the Chinse leader in which Mr. Deng Xiao Ping confirmed that the Sino-Indian border issue should be settled rationally in a spirit of mutual understanding and mutual accommodation. We look forward to the Chines side putting forward its proposals at the eighth round of talks, and we shall put forward our proposals also. We believe that the five principles of peaceful coexistence should continue to guide the relations between our two countries and hope that the persisting differences in regard to the border can be resolved through peaceful negotiations.

Meanwhile, we have taken note of the fact that it has been possible to make some progress in our relations with China, marked by exchanges of delegations in various fields.

Several hon. Members have touched upon our relations with Bangladesh. We attach very great importance to these relations with that country which is not only our close neighbour but whose emergence on the international stage was supported by us at a time of great crisis for our own country in 1971.

The outstanding issues between the two countries referred to by many Members, are not an unusual feature of relations betwen two neighbours with a long, common border and shared history. Issues of sharing water resources, the influx of Chakma refugees into Tripura and boundary demarcation were discussed by me during my visit to Dhaka in Jan. 1986. These have again been taken up during the on-going meeting between our two Foreign Secretaries over the last two days. As I speak here, I may inform the hon. House that our Foreign Secretary, Mr. Menon, is now-a-days in Bangladesh exactly to talk our matters of vital interest because of the importance that we give to these matters. In today's newspapers we have seen that the two Foreign Secretaries have agreed in principle that these Chakma tribals who have come into Tripura should go back to Bangladesh. At present the number of Chakma refugees who have come in from Bangladesh is almost 50 thousand. Here we are faced with a human problem. Since these tribals have fled from Bangladesh out f fear for their safety and security, it has been difficult for our border agencies to forcibly turn them away. However, it should be noted that the problem of Chakmas is not really a bilateral problem between India and Bangladesh, but it is essentially an internal problem of Bangladesh. These are Bangladesh citizens who are living temporarily in refugee camps in Tripura. They will have to return to Bangladesh and their early return has to be planned for. We hope that the Government in Bangladesh will create conditions at the earliest so that these Chakma refugees can go back to Bangladesh.

We greatly value our relations with Nepal There was a reference by some hon. Members that a work permit system has been introduced in Nepal. Specially Mr. Chaturanan Mishra—he is not present here now—has mentioned about this. We enquired about this and we were told this was rather an enforcement of the factory or labour laws in the Kathmandu Valley and it applies to all workers irrespective of the fact whether they are of Indian origin or of Tibetan origin or of any other foreign origin or even the Nepali labourers. But we have asked for more information regarding this. And if there is anything detrimental to the interests of the Indian workers, the Indian citizens there, we will take up the matter. The House will be happy to know that we have recently decided to have a Joint Economic Commission with Nepal. This will be a big step forward so that we can improve our economic and trade relations with Nepal in a proper perspective. Mr. Chaturanan Mishra referred to the problem of rivers that flow from Nepal into India, the problem of huge floods, the problem of soil erosion and soil coming to India and the necessity of having a planned response and a planned initiative to meet this flood problem, to stop soil erosion and soil coming into India and all the periinent problems and also for planning power and irrigation projects. It is not only for this purpose that we have proposed to set up this

[Shri Narayan Datt Tiwari]

economic commission so that we can discuss with Nepal all these bilateral matters. It is all the more necessary because of the geographic dispensation that we have to have good relations with Nepal so that in the long-term and in the medium term we could plan such projects as has been done on the Gandhak project in Bihar and Uttar Pradesh. We hope that Nepal will be forthcoming in this respect and we shall find ways and means both the countries, so that in the future we can further develop our historic and geographic relationship in a more meaningful manner, more purposeful and constructive manner. At this point I might refer to the establishment of SAARC headquarters in Kathmandu. Now, Kathmandu is the central place of SAARC activities, the headquarters being located there. While our friends have talked about our relations with neighbours, we have also taken into account the fact that we have a very good neighbourly relationship as far as multilateral relations are concerned and SAARC is the mainfestation. For the last two years, we have had two summit meetings which is well-known to the Members. This SAARC organisation is a recent phenomenon and is going to play a very great role in improving our relations in the future. Madam, I very well remember that when I had the occasion to lay a statement on the Table of the House regarding SAARC summit at Bangalore, this House and leaders of various Parliamentary groups were good enough to support unanimously this SAARC idea. We hope that now in the coming years the SAARC organisation will consider itself 11 subjects which have already been taken up with 176 items on the anvil pertaining to these 11 subjects. As I said earlier, the next SAARC ministerial meeting, that is, meeting of the Foreign Ministers of 7 States is going to be held at Delhi to discuss further agenda of items and also monitoring the programme that we had accepted at Bangalore and that is also on the anvil and to prepare for the summit meeting of SAARC countries at Kathmandu later this year either in September or October.

There was also a very important reference made, a very appropriate reference made to the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. This is a very important subject as hon. Members will know that this decision was taken by the United Nations General Assembly to have this Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. Now, a committee has been set up to take preparatory action on the declaration of Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. The first meeting of the convening committee has taken place in March this year and the next meeting will take place in July and it is hoped that if this preparatory committee is able to agree on an agenda, then this conference can take place sometime next year. But India is of the firm opinion that this conference must be attended by the big maritime powers, the super-powers because until and unless super-powers attend this meeting, it will not be successful and the objective of the conference will not be achieved. Therefore, we have made it clear in this committee and outside at U. N. forums and at other appropriate forums that super-powers must attend this meeting.

With the United States we have sought to enhance the existing relations in the field of commerce, scientific cooperation and transfer of technology and also build up the considerable fund of goodwill that exists between the people of the United States and our own people. Here I would like to mention that in respect of different perceptions with United States in so many matters, it is necessary for us to carry on a diplomatic dialogue with the United States. The rudimentary principle of diplomacy is that we have to talk on matters of mutual interest not only with those who agree with us but even with those who disagree with us. But sometimes, we have to talk more with those who disagree with the rudimentary principle of diplomacy and it is because of this, we have tried to carry on a continuous dialogue with the United States and it is because of this that my distinguished colleague, Shri Natwar Singh went to the United States. Now, it is not only the U.S. Government that matters under the Constitution. The U. S. Government is

there but also the United States Congress, the Senate, the House of Representaives, the Senate Committees, the House Committees, then representatives of the U.S. public opinion and the United States Press, these are all factors which determine the United States policy. So, we have to have dialogue with the Committees, with the Congress leaders, with the Senators. Madam, I think, most of the Members have met Congressmen here also in New Delhi whenever they visited us. They have visited our Parliament. They have seen the functioning of our Parliament. We have met them formally and informally. Parliament delegations have been exchanged and we know, in the United States Congress, there is a considerable number of Senators and Congressmen who have taken a positive stand for peace. They have supported India's case partly or rather effectively and we have to meet them, we have to keep a constant dialogue with them, with the editors of the press of United States, with the public opinion of the United States and also the Government of United States. Of course, according to the Constitution, the Presidency is the most determining factor there. We have to keep a dialogue with them and it has been in this context that I have been invited to go to United States to carry on this dialogue with the Secretary of State Mr. Schultz and of course, with other leaders of the United States, including possibly President Reagan so that we can tell as to what are the implications of the policy of United States of arming Pakistan. Then, we have to support the disarmament initiative. For example, we fully support the initiatives taken by General Secretary, Gorbachev in the field of disarmament. We have to tell all the world leaders about the Sixth-Nation initiative taken by Five Continents. We have to carry the message of this Six-Nation Five-continent initiative to the United States leadership. We have to convey our full support. Well, it is a very encouraging move that when I myself heard on the television that even President Reagan said, there might be historic agreement possible between him and General Secretary Gorbachev regarding nuclear disaramament, regarding medium range missiles and short range missiles. We welcome that initiative taken by General Secretary Gorbachov and Soviet Foreign Minister Shevanadze by offering even a new proposal in the field of short range missiles which many countries in Europe wanted and even in the field of conventional disarmament. I have a latest report with me in which I find that Victor Karpov, the Director, Arms Control for the Soviet Foreign Ministry said in an interview on American Television that Moscow is ready to begin negotiations to redress any imbalance in conventional forces in Europe. We were told that many NATO countries including France were telling that if nuclear missiles, short-range missiles or medium-range missiles, were withdrawn from Europe, what would happen was that there would be a conventional arms imbalance in Europe. Now, we find that Moscow is seeking to allay even fears regarding the imbalances in conventional armaments. Now what else is required? We fully support the Soviet initiative in this. It shows that General Secretary Gorbachev is fully committed to the New Delhi Declaration signed here and we fully support this initiative and, therefore, we would also like to confirm this support and convey this support to the US leadership and we hope that in the coming days and in the coming months, this first major disarmament move after Reykjavik will come to a success and we shall have a major disarmament reality in the world. We fully support this and this is in accordance with our foreign policy objective. With the Soviet Union and the East European countries we have built up the edifice of friendship in a very stable manner. We have consolidated our friendship and I may inform the honourable House that we are taking steps to implement the decision between our leader, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi and Mr. Gorbachev that we will, in the Next five years, increase our trade and commerce by more than two and a half times. It is a very difficult target to achieve, in five years to have trade and commerce increased by two and a half times, up to a turnover of more than

[Shri Narayan Datt Tiwari]

Rs. 12,000 crores. But we are trying our level best in this context. The Deputy Prime Minister of the Soviet Union Mr. Kamentsev was here a few days back and for three days we sat together and discussed all the modalities and we have formulated a coordinated programme regarding this and I hope to go to Moscow in June to have a full-fledged meeting of the Indo-Soviet Joint Economic Commission and then we will adumbrate, we will concretise, our proposals as to how we can achieve this trade and commerce increased by two and a half times. We are also going to strengthen our relations with COMECON as such. We have already good relations with the EEC, that is, the European Economic Community and we want to establish similar relations with COMECON and we will send a delegation to Moscow to discuss with COMECON as an organisation on what we can do organisationally with COMECON. With the other socialist countries, that is, Eastern Europe, we are trying to have increased trade and commerce. I visited Poland and Czechoslovakia very recently and there we also discussed measures and many other delegations have gone at the official level, at the ministerial level, and we look forward to closer economic relations with the East European countries. With regard to the West European countries, we have already good relations with France.

The French Foreign Minister, Mr. Raymond, was here. As a matter of fact, France has been the first country to declare a donation to the AFRICA Fund, the first Western country, and Mr. Raymond was good enough to announce a twenty million franc donation to the AFRICA Fund. And, Madam, we hope that our bilateral relations with France will improve in the years to come. With the other West European countries, with West Germany, with Italy, with Holland, with Belgium and with the other countries who are members of the EEC, we hope that we will have sound economic agreements. Regarding our relationship with front-line States in Africa we have been very active. My dear colleague, Mr. Faleiro, is sitting beside me. He has spent months together in visiting the remote corners of Africa to establish good relations with all the African countries, to plan a joint action, peaceful action, against apartheid. From the jungles of Mozambique he has been to the mountains of Tunisia, from Siam to Zimbabwe, from Zaire and Male to Kenya. He has talked to the African leaders of all the different shades of public opinion in africa. And this has been mandated by our Prime Minister that he could as a matter of policy discuss with African leaders as to what we can do together for development in countries in Africa and what we can do along with the front-line States to avoid apartheid. The Harare Summit was a resounding success, and I am very happy to report to this august House that we have received a pledge of around 97 million dollars to the Africa Fund. And our Special Envoy, Mr. Krishnan, has been going round to the developed countries also, to ask for contributions on behalf of the Africa Fund. He has been to the Scandanavian countries. He has been to the United Kingdom. He has met the E. E. C. leaders, and we hope that the Africa Fund will be able to subscribe to its objectives.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: What about the African National Congress-A.N.C.?

SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI: My esteemed colleague, Mr. Hari Prasad Sharma, has...

SHRI DEBA PRASAD RAY: Can I make a submission?

SHRI KALPNATH RAI: No interruptions.

SHRI DEBA PRASAD RAY: I believe I am saner than you. My point is that just a few minutes back you have said that our relationship with France has improved and it is expected that it will be more friendly in the days to come. My only submission before your goodself is that while dealing with France we must take into consideration the role that is being played by France in the Pacific

region, the policy that is being pursued by France in the matter of having nuclear tests in the Pacific zone, in the matter of persecuting smaller countries like Caledonia, Polinasia and other small countries which have been subjugated by France, in the matter of destroying Greenpease Ship which has taken place very recently in the Pacific region. So this role of France should also not be forgotten while dealing with this country. This is my humble submission.

SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI: While I am thankful to the hon. Member for this, we have already taken up this matter with France, and I have on my agenda of discussions with the French Foreign Minister these two items. Now, already our point of view is very well known to France. I also take note of it for future also.

Now, Madam, Mr. Chaturvedi, gave a very important suggestion regarding the Asian Relations Conference. As the hon. Members are aware, the first Asian Relations Conference was held in March 1947 in New Delhi. So this year marks the 40th anniversary of that conference. Mr. Chaturvedi made a suggestion that a Conference should be held this year to commemorate the 40th anniversary. We welcome this idea. The Government of India has already considered this. Since the 1947 conference was held under non-governmental auspices, it would only be appropriate that this commemorative conference should also be a non-governmental effort. I understand that several non-governmental organisations of India are already on the job. The India international Centre is also taking an active interest in coordinating all such organisational efforts. A conference is proposed to be held beginning 2nd October. I am happy to announce that this conference to be organised by a non-governmental organisation in India will be inaugurated by our Prime Minister on October 2, 1987. So, we have accepted this idea. But as it is, it has to be a non-governmental effort. Efforts are already on. The idea is already on the anvil. This commemorative conference is expected to be inaugurated by the Prime Minister on 2nd October so that it coincides with Mahatama Gandhi's birthday. The detailed plans for holding this commemorative conference will be announced by the organisation concerned. They have to coordinate their efforts with other countries and organisations. Therefore, it will take some time. But the date of its inauguration has been decided and it is 2nd October.

Hon. Shri Raoof Valiullah has suggested the formation of NAM bank, the bank of Non-Aligned Movement, in the spirit of South-South cooperation. I have mentioned here that according to the decision taken at Harare, a ministerial level meeting is going to be held in Pyongyang, North Korea, specifically on South-South cooperation and we are looking forward to that. All the members of NAM who will be attending this Pyongyang conference, will be coming forward with specific suggestions. In this regard, the hon. Members will also recall that the Group of 77 which includes practically all the members of NAM as well as other developing countries, have been discussing the formation of a South-South bank. There have been several meetings to discuss the formation of a South-South bank and the matter is being pursued in that forum. As I have mentioned, practically all the NAM members are members of the Group of 77 also. We need not duplicate this effort by suggesting a NAM bank because it is the same effort and more or less the same membership. But the idea is very sound. But it is so difficult to give it a realistic and practical shape and to implement it. Therefore let us see what is achieved by this Group of 77.

Now, there was a suggestion by Mr. H. P. Sharma regarding our relations with Bhutan. I may assure him that our relations with Bhutan are excellent. He has mentioned about some interview. I would request him not to give so much importance to this interview because we know definitely that Bhutan is one of our best friends. We are fully assured that they will continue to adhere to the special relationship that we have with

[Shri Narayan Datt Tiwari]

Bhutan. Traditionally, we have close and warm relations and we continue to consult each other on all aspects of our relations and things of mutual concern.

Hon. Mr. Anand Sharma has referred to the proposed aid cut by the United States. I may clarify that this is only one measure by one committee of the U.S. Congress. It has yet to go before the full House and the full Senate. The US Administration has stated publicly and through its Ambassador in New Delhi that they will work towards getting the cut restored. As we know, the US Congressional procedures are very complex and, therefore, it is necessary for us to discuss this only when a final decision has been taken. I have referred to the suggestion made by Mr. Gurupadaswamy about the conference on demilitarisation of the Indian Ocean. I have already dealt with Pakistan. Now, I would like to mention about the remarks made by the hon. Member, Mr. Gurupadaswamy, regarding our Ministry that either they are pro-Russian or pro-US but there is nothing pro-Indian. I think he has rather captured this idea from some publication. I do not know because I do not understand, I cannot believe that this could be a statement of Mr. Gurupadaswamy because if we have to characterise our Ministry in that way, our officials are hundred per cent pro-Indian, and if they are pro-Soviet Union or pro any other country, it is only because they are pro-Indian and nothing else. We are very proud of our Foreign Ministry, our Foreign Ministry officials. If you go round and survey the world foreign offices, the high respect and regard which our Indian Foreign Service commands round the world, I think, it is one of the best foreign Services in the world. We can be proud of that. And their diplomatic acumen, their experience and their command of diplomatic nuances wherever they have gone have left their indelible mark on any diplomatic meeting or international meeting and gathering. So, I think, we should all agree not to demoralise by any means the functioning of our Missions. There may have been individual cases. I do not dispute that. Mr. Gurupadaswamy mentioned that our visitors are not very well treated in many Missions.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is not here.

SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI: He is not here. But whatever he said must be explained because it must be countered. And then, Madam, I have myself visited many Missions. We are trying our level best so that in all the Missions, all the visitors can get the courtesy and respect that they get reasonably in any Mission, and they are the recepients of such a courteous behaviour. So, we are trying for that. Many of our Missions have taken special measures for that. And I may assure the hon. House that we will take all other measures that are necessary in this regard. I only require suggestions for particular Missions. Funds are a constraint in some places. There are so many difficulties as far as new Missions go. But we will try our level best so that we can effectively make our Missions a better service-oriented organisation.

Regarding publicity also, there was a suggestion that our publicity efforts are not very successful because of paucity of funds. I agree, we would like to have more funds for publicity purposes. But till the time we get more funds, we are streamlining our publicity efforts. I have directed all the Missions to have a publicity committee in each Mission headed by the Ambassador or the Head of the Mission himself so that there could be a publicity policy for each country, that what type of publicity is needed for that particular country in that particular region, and what particular language, in what particular manner, and targetted to what particular group. So, we have now asked all our Missions to have a publicity committee...

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: Madam Deputy Chairman, the Minister said about publicity. *(Interruptions)* I

would like to know from the Minister whether this publicity includes the publication of Indian maps also showing the boundaries of India. The Minister has said about publicity. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether this publicity also includes publication of maps, Indian maps. If it is so, nearly 33 maps have been published showing wrong boundaries of India. Even the State of Jammu and Kashmir has been shown as part of Pakistan and even Aksai Chin is depicted in the latest Soviet World Atlas as part of China. So, there are so many such maps in the world. Has the Government published corrected maps and distributed them to all the missions?

SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI: Madam, I think that my dear friend, Mr. Satyanarayan Reddy has brought in an entirely new point. It does not refer to our internal publicity. It refers to maps published by some countries, not our own publicity. Of course, we have always published our own maps. And, wherever there have been misprints or wrong printing of maps by other countries there also we have taken them up through our diplomatic missions abroad strongly. And in many countries—of course, I cannot give all the details just now—they have corrected the maps, as far as your point goes. I am talking at the moment of internal publicity, publicity made on behalf of our embassies, our missions and our High Commissions. When I am speaking about publicity, I am speaking about internal publicity, publicity made on behlf of our missions.

Now, this question was primarily raised by Mr. P. N. Sukul. As regards Indians overseas, we do recognise that Indians overseas are a potential bridge of cooperation and understanding. It is also being increasingly appreciated that the NRIs are an asset to our country and form a potential reservoir of goodwill. To utilise their expertise and talents for national development various facilities and schemes have been drawn up by the Government.

MR. Vahiullah and Mr. Matto mentioned about facilities to Haj pilgrims. It was my pleasure and privilege to visit the Haj House in Bombay this magnificent edifice only day before yesterday to participate in a Kora and lottery, that we organise every year in the Haj House. Now, the hon. Members of the House will be happy to know that this year the number of Haj pilgrims has been raised by two thousand. Already this year we have increased the number of Haj pilgrims. The additional facility for Haj pilgrims so that they could go by air from Delhi, it has already been introduced. Now, this year or next year, it is proposed, whenever facilities are available, it is proposed to see that Haj yatries could also go by air from Madras and Calcutta. Hon. Mr. Matto was referring to Srinagar. Of course, this announcement has been made by Hon. Prime Minister and as soon as necessary facilities are available, we will do it. You know, at the moment there are no international flights from Srinagar direct. But as and when the logistics of the matter are resolved such service will be made available. We have also discussed the possibility of increasing facilities for Haj pilgrims in Saudi Arabia. I have directed my mission there, our embassy there to discuss this matter with Saudi Arabia in order to see as to how we can give more facilities to our pilgrims while they are going for Haj to Saudi Arabia. Already the local voluntary organisations have been contacted. I must compliment my colleague in the other House. Hon. Mr. Sait for having taken the initiative. He has already been able to contact some organisations and they have created certain facilities for our pilgrims in Saudi Arabia. I must congratulate, Mr. Sait for that. There are some wakfs and some wakf properties in Saudi Arabia. They are under nobody's control nowadays. We have created, our Haj Committee has created and considered a proposal by which all these wakfs could be reorganised so that their assets could be at the service of thousands of pilgrims who visit Mecca and Medina every year. So we are taking steps in this direction also. I will very much appreciate if we have concrete suggestions from Hon. Members in this connection so that whatever we

[Shri Narayan Datt Tiwari]

can do to facilitate our Haj pilgrims to help them, that we will try to do. I must complement Mr. Kalpnath Rai who in fluent Hindi postulated the basic principles of our foreign policy. I must tell him that we are in full agreement with the policy nuances that he made.

Shrimati Jayanthi Natarajan, in her flawless English, also made a very good presentation. Mr. Satya Prakash Malaviya is a very good old friend of mine for the last 30 years. Of course, being a Member of opposition, he was trying—I could see very easily—very hard to reconcile his stand with his support for our objectives. It was difficult for him but somehow I could find that he had a soft corner for us, for the objectives at least, and I must compliment him that he was actually fulfilling the greatness of his name Satya Prakash. The truth inside his heart was coming out because of Prakash—Satya Prakash.

Mr. D. P. Ray said that he is speaking after a long time. But he spoke a flowery language while I was trying to listen through the earphone and when I tried to take out this instrument, it was difficult to understand but I could find through his oration that he is so much dedicated to our policy and our objectives.

Then, Shri Bir Bhadra Pratap Singh—I think he is here; I very much welcome his ideological conviction, the way he analysed imperialism, neo-colonialism and all that. I think it was a very good study and I agree with most of his ideological formulations. Of course, in certain matters, we cannot be very dogmatic. But I think on the ideological part of it, he made a good analysis and I support him.

Shri Thakur Jagatpal Singh also supported us and our policy. I am thankful to him. Then Mr. Mahajan also spoke. I think he is a budding diplomat; a diplomat in the making. I would advise him to refine his ideas and he would find that he is in complete agreement with us. We might be in different parties but our basic objective is the same.

There are some other points but I think it is already 8.15 and probably many more opportunities will come for me.

In the end, I would say, I am reminded of one illuminating factor. As we enter the portals of Parliament, as we enter this great edifice of our Constitutional being, at the gate No. 1 of Central Hall, as we enter, I find this Sanskrit Shloka embedded in the building as a mighty edifice;

अयं निजः परो वेति

गणना लघुचेतसाम् ।

उदारचरितानां तु ।

वसुधैव कुटुम्बकम् ।।

This invocation of the Vedas, this foreign policy declaration has not come now but it is from ages, from centuries ago. This has been the formulation of our sages, our rishis and munis and cultural savants. This formulation is the basic objective—it continues to be the basic objective—of this nation today, of our people, of all the political parties and of this House as well. Therefore, I would say—

"उदार चरितानां वसुधैव कुटुम्बकम्"

"The whole world is one family".

Let this be the guiding principle of our foregin policy, as blessed by this House, as sanctified by this House. I would say, Madam, this debate today, with its ramifications, has further strengthened our resolve, our common resolve to stand by this peroration, this sacred message, this sacred sloka of the Vedas, the Sastras, of our Rishis and Munis:

"उदार चरितानां वसुधैव कुटुम्बकम्"

Let us dedicate ourselves to this great objection as declared even in the New Delhi Declaration. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House is now adjourned and we will meet again at 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at sixteen minutes past eight of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 28th April, 1987.